



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines


Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>



Per. 971 c. $\frac{10}{17}$

:

.

.

.

.

.

.

.

EVANGELICAL REVIEW.

OCTOBER 1868.



EDINBURGH : PRINTED BY JOHN GREIG AND SON.

THE
BRITISH AND FOREIGN
EVANGELICAL REVIEW.

VOL. XVII.

LONDON :
JAMES NISBET & CO., BERNERS STREET.
EDINBURGH : OLIVER & BOYD.

MDCCCLXVIII.

Edinburgh :
Printed by John Greig & Son.

CONTENTS OF VOL. XVII.

NO. LXIII.—JANUARY 1868.

Art.	Page
I. "THE CATHOLIC REVIVAL:" ITS LATEST ASPECT,	1
II. THE EASTERN QUESTION—ITS RELIGIOUS BEARINGS,	28
III. A MAHOMEDAN COMMENTARY ON THE BIBLE, .	50
IV. SCOTTISH CHRISTIANITY AND MR BUCKLE, .	66
V. TYNDALE AND THE ENGLISH BIBLE, . .	89
VI. RATIONALISM NOT ALLIED TO PROTESTANTISM, .	114
VII. LIVES OF CELEBRATED JEWISH RABBIS, .	135
VIII. GERMAN HISTORY OF THE REFORMATION, .	156
IX. PAGE'S "MAN: WHERE, WHENCE, AND WHITHER?"	170
X. GENERAL LITERATURE,	187
XI. FOREIGN LITERATURE,	210
XII. AMERICAN LITERATURE,	214
XIII. CRITICAL NOTICES,	220

NO. LXIV.—APRIL 1868.

I. THE SWEDISH REFORMATION,	229
II. SCOTO-CALVINISM AND ANGLO-PURITANISM, .	255
III. THE TEMPLE AND THE SYNAGOGUE, . .	275
IV. RECENT EXPLORATIONS IN JERUSALEM, . .	288
V. MILL'S REPLY TO HIS CRITICS,	382
VI. IRELAND AND THE IRISH,	368
VII. GENERAL LITERATURE,	401
VIII. FRENCH LITERATURE,	416
IX. GERMAN LITERATURE,	426
X. AMERICAN LITERATURE,	481
XI. CRITICAL NOTICES,	485

Contents.

NO. LXV.—JULY 1868.

Art.	Page
I. MONTALEMBERT ON ST COLUMBA, . . .	449
II. CAMBRIDGE CHARACTERISTICS IN THE 17TH CENTURY, . . .	477
III. THE PRESENT AND FUTURE POSITION OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.	489
IV. THE GREAT ST BERNARD HOSPICE, . . .	500
V. YOUNG'S LIFE AND LIGHT OF MEN, . . .	527
VI. TISCHENDORF ON THE GOSPELS, . . .	551
VII. MR GLADSTONE'S 'ECCE HOMO,' . . .	563
VIII. GERMAN ROMANISM,	590
IX. GENERAL LITERATURE,	606
X. GERMAN LITERATURE,	625
XI. FRENCH LITERATURE,	642
XII. CRITICAL NOTICES,	648

NO. LXVI.—OCTOBER 1868.

I. THE SWEDISH REFORMATION,	661
II. ANALYTICAL COMMENTARY ON THE ROMANS, . . .	684
III. THE NORWEGIAN CHURCH,	722
IV. PHILO JUDÆUS,	732
V. ASSYRIA AND HER MONUMENTS,	751
VI. THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF SIN,	776
VII. SCIENCE AND CIVILISATION,	793
VIII. IRONY IN HISTORY : OR, WAS GIBBON AN INFIDEL ?	809
IX. UNPUBLISHED LETTERS OF MELANCTHON, . . .	845
X. GENERAL LITERATURE,	855
XI. FOREIGN LITERATURE,	868
XII. CRITICAL NOTICES,	878

CONTENTS.

NO. LXVI.—OCTOBER 1868.

Art.	Page
I. THE SWEDISH REFORMATION, . . .	661
II. ANALYTICAL COMMENTARY ON THE ROMANS, .	684
III. THE NORWEGIAN CHURCH, . . .	722
IV. PHILO JUDÆUS, . . .	782
V. ASSYRIA AND HER MONUMENTS, . . .	751
VI. THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF SIN, . .	776
VII. SCIENCE AND CIVILISATION, . . .	793
VIII. IRONY IN HISTORY; OR, WAS GIBBON AN INFIDEL ?	809
IX. UNPUBLISHED LETTERS OF MELANCTHON, .	845
X. GENERAL LITERATURE, . . .	855
XI. FOREIGN LITERATURE, . . .	868
XII. CRITICAL NOTICES, . . .	878

BRITISH AND FOREIGN EVANGELICAL REVIEW.

JANUARY 1868.

ART. I.—“*The Catholic Revival :*” *Its Latest Aspect.*

Tracts for the Day : Essays on Theological Subjects. By various Authors. Edited by the Rev. ORBY SHIPLEY, M.A. No. 1, Priestly Absolution. Scriptural; No. 2, Purgatory; No. 3, The Seven Sacraments; No. 5, The Real Presence. London: Longmans & Co. 1867.

The Ritual Reason Why. London: J. T. Hayes.

Mind your Rubrics: Seasonable Thoughts upon the Rubrics, and other important matters, for the consideration of Churchmen. By the Rev. JAMES BARDSLEY, M.A., Rector of St Ann's, Manchester. Second Edition. London: W. Hunt & Co.

Confession, Absolution, and the Real Presence. By ARCHIBALD BOYD, M.A., Incumbent of Paddington, and Hon. Canon of Gloucester. London: Seeleys. 1867.

IN that elaboration of Locke's principles for the “Conduct of the Understanding,” the study of which was enjoined by grand old Samuel Johnson as of “paramount importance,” we read of a “ridiculous contest” in which “the two unlearned combatants, Sartor and Sutor, assaulted and defended the doctrine of transubstantiation with much zeal and violence; but Latino happening to come into their company, and inquiring the subject of their dispute, asked each of them what he meant by that long, hard word transubstantiation. Sutor readily informed him that he meant—bowing at the name of Jesus: but Sartor assured him that he meant nothing but bowing at the high altar. ‘No wonder then,’ said Latino, ‘that you cannot agree when you neither understand one another, nor the word about which you contend.’” Let us hope that the homeliness of this illustration may be condoned on account of its

pertinence. We shall very largely have diminished the number of interminable disputes when we have learned to express, in strictly definitive terms, none but definite ideas. This may not always be easy. Paradoxical as it may seem, it is yet true that the simplest questions are the most difficult to answer. What is a miracle? What is inspiration? It is at once as easy and as hard to say, as it was to Theætetus to answer the question of Socrates, "What is science?" Nay, even in relation to the commonest concerns of daily life, the fallacies that lurk beneath ambiguous terms are often found where least suspected. It was but the other day that we saw the possession of vast wealth made to depend on the skill with which opposing counsel elaborated learned arguments in order to obtain, in favour of their respective clients, the decision of the court on that most abstruse question, "What is coal?"

Nothing is more common, and at the same time more indefinite, than the use of the term "Real Presence" by those persons who intend by "real" to signify "corporeal." While on the other hand, the reality of the presence is not less strenuously maintained by those who, denying altogether its corporeity, affirm it to be only "spiritual." To remedy this defect of indefiniteness, "real" has been supplemented by the metaphysical term "objective," an addition which serves only to introduce additional ambiguity. On this head, the recent utterance of a dignitary of the Church of England is worthy of attention, not more from the character and position of the speaker than from its own intrinsic importance. The venerable Archdeacon of York, in the "Charge" just addressed to the clergy of his archdeaconry, used these words:—

"You will therefore, I trust, bear with me if I venture to point out what seems to me to be the nucleus of the whole question, of which the ritualistic controversy is nothing more than an outward and visible sign. It is simply this: Does the holy sacrament of the Lord's Supper impart a blessing to other than recipients, so that they are partakers of the blessing who are not partakers of the sacrament? The Church of Rome, and certain members of the Church of England, adopt the affirmative position; the Church of England (as I read its formularies), the contrary; and I cannot find that Scripture gives any support to the former view. This way of stating the question has the advantage of putting before us a simple issue, which some of the other test-terms proposed do not equally afford. I believe that many of those who affirm, and many of those who deny the real presence, express precisely the same doctrine in different language; and even the newly invented phrase, 'real objective presence,' is ambiguous, as some may mean by it a presence not *created* by the faith of the recipient,

and others, a presence not *conditioned* by that faith. In the former sense, the term “objective” would be a mere protest against Zuinglianism; in the latter, as it seems to me, it would be a direct denial of the doctrine of our Twenty-ninth Article. But the meaning of the question as stated above is not so easily misapprehended. I will put it, if you please, in other words. Is communion merely of the essence of the sacrament, or is it not rather its very essence? I believe that both holy Scripture and the English Church have given plain and unequivocal answers to this question, and that their voices are in complete agreement. Our formularies know nothing of ‘a tremendous and unbloody sacrifice,’ or of ‘eucharistic adoration,’ but they declare, in the very words of Scripture, that ‘the bread which we break is a partaking of the body of Christ, and likewise the cup of blessing is a partaking of the blood of Christ.’”*

How, by the primitive church, the presence in the sacrament was understood only “after a heavenly and spiritual manner;” by what process of carnal reasonings the heresy of a material presence was first privily brought in; how, after centuries of Sacerdotalism, the pure faith was recovered by the constancy of a noble army of martyrs; how the contention of that fierce and fiery conflict was followed by a period of fancied security, while men slept and the enemy sowed tares; how thickly the tares sprang up, and with what bitter fruit, so that at this hour the Reformed Church of England is in imminent peril of the loss of all her martyrs held so dear: these things are too notorious to need repetition. Even now we are in the midst of a crisis of which none can foresee the issue. Now, if ever, it behoves us to take our stand on first principles. What will be the end no man can foretell; but there can be no possible mistake as to our present duty—“*Obsta principiis.*”

Among the many significant signs of the times in relation to this subject, the disappearance of the old landmarks is not the least remarkable. To illustrate this the more clearly, let us take an example *ab extra*. “When strangers are so unfavourably impressed with us,” says Dr Newman, “because they see images of our Lady in our churches, and crowds flocking about her, they forget that there is a presence within the sacred walls infinitely more awful, which claims and obtains from us a worship transcendently different from any devotion we pay to her. That devotion might indeed tend to idolatry, if it were encouraged in Protestant churches, where there is nothing higher than it to attract the worshipper; but all the images

* A Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Archdeaconry of York, by the Venerable W. Basil Jones, at his primary visitation, April 30 1867.

that a Catholic Church ever contained, all the crucifixes at its altars brought together, do not so affect its frequenters as the lamp which betokens the presence or absence there of the blessed sacrament. Is not this so certain, so notorious, that on some occasions it has even been brought as a charge against us that we are irreverent in church, when what seemed to the objectors to be irreverence was but the necessary change of feeling which came over those who were there, on their knowing that their Lord was away?”* This passage has scarcely received the attention which it deserves. That which chiefly “affects the frequenters of a Catholic Church,” the “crowds flocking about the images of our lady,” is—a lamp: “the lamp which betokens the presence or absence there of the blessed sacrament.” When the lamp is absent, the sacrament is absent; and when the sacrament is absent, the “Lord” is absent. We are at present concerned, however, less with the explicitness of this declaration than with its author. For this Dr Newman “of the Oratory” was, thirty years ago, the leader of that party which to-day, under his successor, threatens to subvert the faith of the Church of England. At that time his chosen terms for describing the communion, which he soon proceeded to join, were, “a lost church,” “the papal apostasy.” It was pronounced “heretical,” and declared to have “bound itself by a perpetual covenant to the cause of antichrist;” men were exhorted to “flee it as a pestilence;” it was compared to “a demoniac,” and to the devil himself; while its doctrines were condemned as “profane,” “impious,” “blasphemous,” “gross,” “monstrous,” and “cruel.” Such strong declarations answered their purpose but too well. For whenever any one was startled by the Romanising tendency of the later Tracts, then these denunciations were confidently appealed to, as convincing proof that “to oppose ultra-Protestantism”—for then, as now, that was the cant of the day—“is not to favour Popery.” At last, when Mr Newman had no longer any purpose to serve in allowing them to be quoted as the expression of his sincere opinions, he withdrew them, telling the world that in using them he had *said to himself*, “I am not speaking my own words, I am but following almost a *consensus* of the divines of my church. They have ever used the strongest language against Rome, even the most able and learned of them. I wish to throw myself into their system. While I say what they say, I am safe. Such views, too, are necessary for our position.”† No doubt they were. A false position cannot be concealed without a false representation. But Mr Newman knew

* Letter to the Rev. E. B. Pusey, D.D., on his recent *Eirenicon*, pp. 99–100.

† Letter to *The Conservative Journal* (Oxford), Dec. 12. 1842

better than to tell this to the dupes whom he was misleading. For them he had a very different story. The private explanation was, as he tells us, what "I said to myself."

But the influence possessed by Mr Newman, as leader of the Tractites, was trifling and insignificant when compared with that which is enjoyed by Dr Pusey. Whatever question may exist as to the character of that influence, there can be no question as to its extent. We may adopt the complimentary language of the eminent oratorian: "There is no one anywhere—among ourselves, in your own body, or, I suppose, in the Greek Church,—who can affect so vast a circle of men, so virtuous, so able, so learned, so zealous, as come, more or less, under your influence;"* or we may concur in the belief of "S. G. O.,†" "that Dr Pusey has done more mischief to the Protestant Church than any other man living who yet professes to belong to it;" in either case we shall do well to inquire what it is that Dr Pusey teaches as the true doctrine of the real presence.

The answer is at hand. It is furnished in three distinct and recent statements by Dr Pusey himself. On the 27th of January last, Dr Heurtley preached before the University of Oxford, a sermon on "The Doctrine of the Eucharist, Christ's Presence by Spirit and Grace." On the Sunday following, Dr Pusey preached in the same place and on the same subject a sermon of a directly opposite character. In the preface to this sermon he says, "I have simply, as my subject suggested, stated incidentally the doctrine of the holy eucharist, which I believe as matter of faith, which (without any idea of controversy) I preached in a practical sermon which was condemned extrajudicially in 1843–4. I restated it summarily in the opening of the first which I preached after my suspension in 1846; vindicated it more systematically in that of 1853; and supported [it] more fully in two volumes as being the doctrine of the Catholic Church from the first, and of our own." So that, on Dr Pusey's own shewing, the doctrine of the real presence which he now holds and teaches, is so far from being that of the Church of England, that it is the very doctrine for which he was condemned and suspended in 1843. This is the most recent statement, and not the least important. The second, equally explicit, is made in his defence of the posthumous alteration of the poem entitled "Gunpowder Treason," in Keble's "Christian Year." The ground of objection to the words as, previous to the alteration, they had stood in the ninety-five editions published during their author's lifetime, is stated by Dr Pusey himself to have been this; that "the words

* Letter to Pusey, p. 5.

† Letter to *The Times*, Dec. 25. 1866.

in their strict literal meaning” “affirm that our Lord gives himself to the soul of the receiver only, and is not present objectively ;” while Keble’s actual belief is represented as being, in common with Dr Pusey’s, “the belief in the doctrine of the real objective presence, of which antiquity is so full.”* The third is found in the statements of the Eirenicon, and the reassertion of all the popish principles of Tract XC. Dr Manning had said, “If the Church of England recognises an undefined presence of Christ in the sacrament, it formally imposes upon its people a disbelief in transubstantiation, and the sacrifice of the altar.” To this Dr Pusey replies by a compromise which betrays the cause it was his duty to defend. He says expressly, “I am persuaded that, on this point, the two churches might be reconciled by explanation of the terms used.”† With the illustrations of the doctrine of reserve, and “*οἰκονομία*” and “*φειλακισμός*,” supplied by Dr Newman’s history before us, we cannot be surprised by any statements of this sort proceeding from Dr Pusey. In Mr Keble’s case, however, the gradual growth of these opinions is more evident ; for in his “*Eucharistical Adoration*,” he admits that Hooker was not a believer in the real presence (in his, Keble’s sense) ; while in his preface to Hooker’s works, he praises Hooker’s judgment on the nature of the Reality, and nowhere indicates any defect.

But if, turning from individual names, we ask what has been the effect of this influential and most subtle teaching on the nation at large, we find for answer the startling fact, that while in 1843 Dr Pusey’s teaching was all but universally condemned, in 1867, the very same teaching is all but universally approved. On this head we will be content to cite but a single witness. The Bishop of Ossory in his recent most valuable charge, after drawing attention to the “*histrionic development*” of the Tract party, proceeds to shew that concurrently with this, there has been a departure from the recognised and fundamental prin-

* Letter to *The Times*, Dec. 12. 1866.

† “*Eirenicon*,” p. 28. At a meeting of the English Church Union, held June 14. 1866, he used the following words:—“What I have stated to Gallican bishops, and what they have clearly understood, was this : That I believed the Council of Trent, whatever its look was, and our articles, whatever their look was, could be so explained as to reconcile one with another. I saw a theologian, and one of the most eminent. We talked for two hours about the Council of Trent, and about our belief, as it is expressed by those whom we considered to be the most genuine sons of the Church of England. The result was that point after point he was satisfied, and the interview ended in his saying, I shall salute you as a true brother.” On this it has been pertinently remarked, “If Dr Pusey could satisfy a Romish theologian, ‘and one of the most eminent,’ who believed all Protestants to be heretics, and out of the way of salvation, that he himself was ‘a true brother,’ he must have made it pretty clear to him that his own views were Romish.”

ciples of the church, which has attracted less attention, and excited less alarm, but which "is really more formidable than any approximation which has been made to Rome in outward things." He then refers to the silent passivity with which the "*Eirenicon*" has been received by the church at large :— "The advance has been lately made matter of loud boast by some of the organs of the Catholic party. And among the evidences of its extent and importance, there is none that is dwelt upon with more exultation, very naturally and justly, I think, than the manner in which the publication of Dr Pusey's *Eirenicon* last year was received, as contrasted with the reception which Tract XC. met with, when it appeared five and twenty years ago. It is truly stated, that the volume reiterates in a stronger form all the positions of the tract, together with all the arguments by which they are sustained. But how differently were the two publications received ! The church was agitated, and almost torn asunder by the tract. Outcries of indignation and alarm were heard from every part of the land. It added a new controversy to those which were already raging ; and widened and embittered the actual divisions of the church. It was long before the storm subsided, and still longer before the traces which it left disappeared, if, indeed, some of them do not still remain. Such, it is said, were the results of the publication of the tract. But the volume raised no such storm. By the Catholic party in the church it was received with sympathy, approval, and admiration. And that party was now so much in the ascendant, that those who did not belong to it, did not venture to offer any opposition to its sentence upon the work."

How far this departure from first principles obtains sympathy in high places, may partly be inferred from the terms of another episcopal charge just delivered, in which the Bishop of Salisbury argues that the clergy, "when consecrating the elements as Christ's representatives, are putting forth some of his delegated power." His lordship further lays it down as the teaching of the church, that (1.) certain men have entrusted to them by God, as fellow-workers with him, some supernatural powers and prerogatives ; and (2.) that, *e.g.*, God has been pleased to invest them as his ministers with the power of "so blessing the oblations of bread and wine, as to make them the channels of conveying all the strength and refreshing power of the body and blood of Christ." And yet there is no doubt that the bishop cordially accepts the declaration of the Homilies, that the presence of Christ in the sacrament, is the presence "not of a carnal, but of a ghostly substance," not a physical or a material presence, but a presence spiritual, because divine. But this, after all, is not Dr Pusey's doctrine,

and therefore is universally rejected by the school of which we speak. That school has, it must be confessed, a somewhat difficult task. Its most zealous teachers cannot forget the former fate of Archdeacon Denison and Dr Pusey. What has happened once may happen again. While, therefore, as Dr Pusey has shewn, their doctrine of the real presence is essentially that of Rome, it is desirable that (for the moment, *i.e.* as long as it continues “necessary for their position”), it should be enunciated in equivocal and ambiguous terms. And this, with the aid of that “economy” and “phenakism” which were found so useful at Oxford in 1843, has hitherto been done with as much cleverness of Gnosticism, and as complete success, as might have secured the admiration, not to say the approval, of Clement himself. Thus, for example, the *Church Review*, in a recent article, says, “The elements of bread and wine remain in their own natural, material substance, but in the act of consecration the Holy Ghost breathes on them, and they become the life-giving body and blood of Christ;” an assertion unsupported by a shadow of argument, but it serves its purpose, for while the first clause is so worded as to avert suspicion, the second is nothing less than that essential popery which sent the martyrs to the stake. Similarly, in Mr Mackonochie’s “Address to the Parishioners of St Alban’s,” we read, “I believe that the elements of bread and wine remain in their own natural, material substance; yet that they are ‘after consecration, not that which nature formed, but that which the benediction has consecrated, and by consecration changed.’” For Mr Hallam’s observation, that logically speaking there can be nothing predicated concerning a body in its relation to a given space, but presence and absence, the theologians of this school have a sublime contempt. Hence we read, “It is literally true that the consecrated bread is Christ’s body,” in the words of the very writer who speaks of a “supralocal presence in the holy sacrament.” And this word “supralocal” is adopted by Mr Mackonochie (from those whom he calls “most thoughtful theologians”) and applied to the body and blood of Christ, which, he says, “in the holy eucharist are present not figuratively, but as an existing reality.” He adds that, being thus present, they are “objectively given by the priest, objectively taken by every communicant;” and further, “this presence is the presence of God the Word incarnate;” and “this presence I believe to be conferred by the word of Christ as spoken by the priest, through the operation of God the Holy Ghost, irrespective of faith or any personal qualifications either in the consecrator or receiver.” In the “Little Office Book,” a favourite manual of this party, the preparation

for holy communion is headed, “Devotions for the Mass.” The sort of real presence insisted on may be gathered from the fact, that those who partake are taught “At the Elevation of the Host,” a form of adoration to the sacred flesh. In the “Little Prayer Book,” communicants are directed to worship the Saviour verily and indeed present on his altar; then to say, “Hail, true body! born of Mary, spotless Virgin’s virgin birth.” Among the directions for receiving the communion, we read, “Be most careful to receive into your mouth all, even the smallest portion, since one crumb or drop of it is worth more than the world itself.” We need not therefore be surprised at the prayer, “Blood of Christ inebriate me!”* In a word, the teaching of this school amounts to the teaching of Dr Newman himself. In the sacrament, Christ in his manhood is “present on his altar;” and in the absence of the sacrament, the Lord himself is away. Present (according to Dr Pusey) in “his flesh, the very flesh which was born of the Virgin Mary, and is now glorified at God’s right hand.” Present (according to, if possible, a still higher authority) “in that which my Saviour took of the Virgin Mary, and offered as a sacrifice upon the cross.” This presence is conveyed to the elements by the word of the priest, irrespective of faith in consecrator or receiver. Froude may rest satisfied. His successors no longer “flinch from saying that the power of *making the body and blood of Christ* is vested in the successors of the apostles.”†

It is this outspoken plainness which constitutes, perhaps, the chief merit of the “Tracts” specified at the head of this paper. They are very heavy reading. They abound in a tedious iteration of undefined platitudes. But they are very unequivocal. They propound the loftiest pretensions of sacerdotalism; but they shew no sign of flinching. Their Tridentinism is more pronounced than even that of the “Eirenicon;” and so, too, is their indifference to disguise. In the prefatory postscript with which they are published, their object is thus announced:—“They will aim at stating in plain language the reasons which make the religionism of the day untenable, and will illustrate and defend the historical belief and traditional practice of Christendom. They will thus be at once aggressive

* “For one whom our books of controversy have brought round, at least twenty have yielded to the power of our devotions.” Such is the testimony of a recent Romish writer, in reference to Dr Pusey’s adaptations of popish manuals of devotion for the use of the members of the Church of England. “Adaptations” of which even the Bishop of Oxford long since felt constrained to say, “It is accordingly my full conviction that the circulation and use of these works, many of which were originally composed and circulated purposely to counteract the Reformation, has had, and still has, a most dangerous influence in this direction.”—(*Charge*, 1851, p. 61).

† Froude’s Remains, vol. i. p. 326.

and constructive ; and, whilst seeking to avoid that timid indecision which calls itself ‘moderation,’ they will carefully eschew polemical bitterness.”

The first of these promises is, at all events, amply redeemed. There is no lack of “plain speaking ;” and there is no leaning towards a “timid indecision.” But then, on the other hand, the plain speaking is not true ; and this decision is nothing better than a persistent refusal to call things by their right names. “These Essays,” says the editor, “will be addressed to educated and intelligent catholics, who, as loyal members of the Church of England, are unable to accept the popular explanation of the doctrines, and decline to be bound by the popular misrepresentations of her discipline.” But this very sentence itself conveys a gross misrepresentation. For “loyal members of the Church of England” soon discover that the doctrines here propounded are not “*her* doctrines” at all ; but the doctrines of her most dangerous foe. Her doctrines—the distinctive truths for which her martyrs deliberately went to the stake—are here denied, derided, and then denounced, as “Protestant,” and “Puritan”—the mere “religionism of the day.” A few extracts will enable our readers to judge for themselves.*

“The Catholic Church, both east and west, acknowledges ‘Seven Sacraments,’ but not all of equal importance” (p. 2). “Before, however, we analyse each of the seven sacraments one by one, it will be useful to examine the *rationale* of the sacramental system of the Catholic Church, in order to perceive the purpose of using material substances as forms for conveying spiritual gifts. It may seem strange, at first sight, that Almighty God should use material substances at all for this purpose. Why not impart spiritual gifts without any medium whatever ? Why use the elements of a fallen world, and to some extent, a world lying under a curse, for this end ? The most obvious reason, and one which at once presents itself to our apprehension, is that of *similia similibus curantur*.” “Temples, altars, sacrifices, mean more than mere shadows of the atonement—they form a part of it.”† “Will not His unction be employed by him to redeem his creatures ; and will not his creatures be redeemed through a like means ? Shall not his creatures of bread, and wine, and oil, nay, the poor weak element of water, join with his person and his Spirit in redeeming man ?” (pp. 4, 5, 6).

* They are taken chiefly from the largest and most comprehensive :—“No. 8, The Seven Sacraments.” The reference is to this therefore, when no other is specified.

† Italics ours.

From the circumstances of the miracle recorded by St Mark (vii. 32), it is asserted "that such outward signs in religion as sacraments, are absolutely necessary for a certain class of minds, in order to realise the communion of God with man;" "and therefore, that any wilful departure from such order, *any attempt at communion with God*, otherwise than through these outward media, is not only contrary to His economy, but *must fail of its end*"* (p. 7). The next step in the argument is the proposition, "that a variety in the sacraments is necessary to meet the varieties of sin, and man's sinful condition; and that if, for the purpose of simple conversion, preaching *may be*† sufficient; yet for the higher and deeper purposes of recovery from falls into sin, or from the dominion of a besetting sin, sacramental rites with prayer and fasting are absolutely requisite" (p. 8). "As long as children are born in sin, so long must there be means whereby they may be born again of the Spirit. As long as men, even the regenerate, sin wilfully, so long must there be means of conveying pardon. As long as grace is needed to support spiritual life, so long must there be means for bestowing it" (p. 13). These means are found solely and exclusively in the "Sacramental System of the Catholic Church;" and "to suppose that Christ did not leave such grace and power in his Church, is to confess that the means of salvation are yet wanting" (*Ib.*).

"We are now in a position to consider the component parts of the Sacramental System of the Catholic Church separately." To begin with Matrimony:—"Any form which includes the consent of the two contracting parties, whether heathen or Christian, and is consequently consummated, is no doubt a marriage; but it is not the sacrament of Holy Matrimony." "To make marriage a sacrament, there must be, besides the consent of the contracting parties, the sacerdotal benediction;" "that blessing, 'Be fruitful and multiply,' which is the end and purpose of the sacrament" (pp. 18, 19). "Those who are intended and purposed to become members of Christ, children of God, and finally, inheritors of the kingdom of heaven, have their beginning from this sacrament" (p. 20). And then "Holy Matrimony being regarded as a sacrament ordained for the purpose of bringing into the world persons who are to become children of God through being new born of Holy Church, the latter has thought fit to appoint that this sacrament be celebrated only at such times, as well as in such a manner, as benefits this end and purpose" (p. 22).

The second part of this Sacramental System is introduced with this declaration:—"Matrimony is the fount and well-

* Italics ours.

† Italics author's.

spring from whence come those who are to be visible members of His body ; Holy Order supplies the spiritual life, without which the body is but dead. Matrimony furnished the eleven disciples of our Lord. He gave them His Spirit to enable them to communicate to the body the eternal life, which he had purchased for it.” Christ himself has gone away into a far country to receive a kingdom, and to return. Meanwhile he has left the care of his kingdom to his servants, until he returns ; and until then he has endowed them with the fullest powers for governing his kingdom ” (p. 28). “ The whole work of salvation is to be accomplished in the state of trial and preparation here, unless we believe in a further state of preparation and trial in the interval between death and resurrection.* There must needs then be the fullest powers in the priesthood to supply such grace as is needed for this work, and equally full powers to convey pardon to offenders. Unless priests possess these powers, they have not the ‘ ministry of reconciliation ’ committed to them ” (p. 36).

“ Let us now consider the Five Sacraments which concern us as individual members of Christ’s body, the Church.” Here we begin with a reprehension of that “ confusion of thought ” which “ has its origin principally in overlooking the special kind of grace attached to each several sacrament ” (p. 40). The “ gift bestowed in Holy Order,” for example, “ is a gift of power, unattended, at least necessarily, by that of personal sanctification. Yet how common a thing it is to hear the gift in a priest denied, because he does not manifest the gifts of holiness of life ! ” “ While speaking of the sacramental gifts as food and medicine for the spiritual life, we must not fall into the common error of confounding the spiritual life with the soul the spiritual life belongs to the body as well as to the soul ; ” “ and our bodies as well as our souls are sanctified by the sacraments ” (pp. 41, 42).

“ Life and immortality, grace and righteousness, are the special gifts of Christ, purchased by his atonement for man ; and these must be communicated to man, to make him even capable of being a member of Christ’s body, a son of the heavenly Father, and a citizen of the spiritual kingdom. The instrument appointed by Christ for the purpose, to convey this gift, to infuse the spiritual life, is Holy Baptism ” (p. 44). “ The way and means for obtaining these is the Sacrament which he ordained. There is no other ” (*Ib.*).

In the section on Confirmation, “ modern Anglican Bishops ”

* What shall we say of the honesty of this argument on the part of those who, like the writers of these “ Tracts,” do so really believe “ in a further state of preparation ” “ between death and resurrection,” that the second tract is written expressly to justify that belief !

are severely castigated for their "practice of deferring confirmation until boys and girls have arrived at fourteen, fifteen, or even sixteen years of age." "There is a species of cold-blooded cruelty in this practice, which can only be accounted for on the supposition that men now do not believe in the Holy Ghost, nor in the promises of Christ; or perhaps we shall speak more correctly if we say, that an intellectual process is substituted for the divine gifts of grace, and it is held that a child is unable to be confirmed by the Holy Ghost until, intellectually, it can confirm itself. In other words, that a sacrament is not, as the church defines it, a means of grace, but is an intellectual process; that the grace of this sacrament does not flow from Christ, but is a mental process evolved from the soul of the recipient of the outward sign—an idea of religion which naturally results in pure Deism" (pp. 53, 54).

The efficacy of Priestly Absolution is asserted in these terms:—"The power which our Lord manifested before the unbelieving Pharisees by working a miracle, he conferred on the priesthood of the church; or rather to speak more correctly, he now exercises through the priesthood." The priests "carry pardon to the penitent" (p. 58). After a gross misrepresentation of the "Protestant direction 'Go direct to Christ,'" we are told explicitly "how the penitent is to go to Christ. He is to go to God's priest and to confess his sins to him. The priest has a commission from Christ to pronounce his pardon; and that pardon so pronounced, will convey not only peace to the soul, but also forgiveness of sins" (p. 60).

The section on "The Sacrament of Unction," is remarkable as an instance of the special pleading which characterises all these productions. It commences thus:—"It is not uncommon for superficial theologians to say that the words 'corrupt following of the apostles' (Art. xxv.), refers specially to the Sacrament. . . . But it is evident that the words apply to all the five, and not to this rite only; and since the other four are in use, [!] we must interpret this phrase to refer rather to the ceremonies attendant on these sacraments, than to the sacraments themselves" (p. 66). On the hardihood of this assertion we make no comment. Having, however, thus disposed of the declaration of the article that Extreme Unction is a corrupt following of the apostles, the next thing is to deal with the fact that the Prayer Book of 1552, and "all subsequent books," have omitted every kind of "form for anointing." But this presents no difficulty. For "Does omission imply prohibition?" "To this we answer, 'Certainly not.'" "What the Prayer Book prohibits is, not the using of extra offices, where none such are provided, but the using of a different office from that provided. We have no right to alter one of the exist-

ing offices, or to substitute another in its place ; but we have a right to use an old office, when the present book does not provide a new one ” (p. 67). Besides, the thirtieth canon of 1603, and Jewel’s Apology, may both be quoted in defence of it. [The fact being just the contrary.] And indeed (the twenty-fifth article notwithstanding), “ Unction is a Sacrament of the Church, and has been so considered from the earliest times, both in the east and west ” (p. 71). And, “ more than this, no branch of the Catholic Church can abolish a sacrament, any more than it can abolish an article of the Creed ” (*Ib.*).

“ The Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist is the Crown of all.”

“ It effects that union of man with God, through the Incarnate Son, which alone completes the redemption wrought and accomplished ” (p. 74). “ Such as are chosen are ‘ added to the Church ’ by Holy Baptism. They are sanctified through the other Sacraments. . . . But this Sacrament incorporates Christ with man, imparts his flesh and blood into man’s flesh and blood, so that he ‘ tabernacles among us,’ and lodges in our individual persons ” (p. 76). “ As the Word became flesh by conception in the womb of the Blessed Virgin, so these elements *become** the body and blood of Christ by consecration ” (*Ib.*). “ Not the grace of Christ only, but Christ himself is given in the Sacrament.” “ This Sacrament confers grace, because it contains Christ, who is the fount and source of all grace. Christ’s passion is the meritorious cause of salvation ; the Holy Eucharist is the instrumental cause, whereby the recipient partakes of the benefits of that passion ” (p. 78). “ That body given *for* man on the cross, is given *to* man in the Holy Eucharist. He who offered his blood for sins, now offers it to man for life ” (p. 86).

Nothing but a great and growing sense of the importance of the subject would have induced us to try so severely the patience of our readers with this enunciation of “ The Sacramental System ” in the very words chosen by its advocates themselves. We shall not be guilty of the impertinence of supposing that what we have transcribed can need any formal refutation here, yet it will be not irrelevant to make a few general remarks.

1. And the first thing that strikes us in reading these productions is their disingenuousness, not to say dishonesty. Here we have a laboured attempt to prove, for the edification of “ loyal members of the Church of England,” the absolute necessity and apostolic validity of “ the seven Sacraments.” And this too, in the face of an authoritative document which teaches every child in her communion to answer the question, “ How many Sacraments hath Christ ordained in his Church ?”

* *Italics author’s.*

"Two ONLY." And the very men who make this attempt, have subscribed (*ex animo*!) that declaration of the twenty-fifth article, which fully contradicts their fundamental assertion!* Such conduct needs no comment.

The thirtieth Canon of 1603 quotes Jewel's Apology as confessing that the Church of England "doth with reverence retain those ceremonies which do neither endanger the Church of God, nor offend the minds of sober men; and only dissented from them in those particular points wherein they were fallen, both from themselves in their ancient integrity, and from the apostolical churches, which were their first founders." Will it be believed that this very passage is quoted in the tract before us (p. 70), as if it favoured that "Sacrament of Unc-tion" which the Church of England has deliberately rejected and condemned?

Extreme Unction is, however, not the only thing rejected by the Church of England since 1549. Prayers for the dead were discarded at the same time. Both are found in the first prayer-book of Edward VI.; both are omitted in all subsequent books. But with this difference: that while the form for anointing was simply omitted, prayers for the dead were expressly excluded. Not only was the entire passage containing the words, "We commend unto thy mercy, O Lord, all other Thy servants which are departed hence from us, with the sign of faith, and now do rest in the sleep of peace" (in consequence of the reasons urged by Bucer† and Calvin‡), omitted; but to the exhortation, "Let us pray for the whole state of Christ's church," there was added that clause of limitation which expressly restricts the prayer to Christ's "church militant here in earth." And yet our Essayist does not scruple to assert, that "in the offering of the great sacrifice in the Holy Eucharist, the names of the Faithful Departed are mentioned together with those of the Faithful who are yet in the flesh, and are alike prayed for before the throne of God!" (p. 77.)

One instance more—the most dangerous and most dishonest of all—and we quit this part of the subject. Dr Manning's charge against the church which he has deserted is, that "it formally imposes upon its people a disbelief in transubstantiation, and the sacrifice of the altar." We admit the charge: we glory in it. "The point of transubstantiation" (says Bishop Hall) "is justly ranked among our highest differences." But what says Dr

* "Those five commonly called Sacraments,—that is to say, Confirmation, Penance, Orders, Matrimony, and Extreme Unction,—are not to be counted for Sacraments of the gospel, being such as have grown partly of the corrupt following of the apostles," &c., &c.

† Script. Anglican. p. 467, 468.

‡ Epistola ad Bucerum.

Pusey ? “I am persuaded that, on this point, the two churches might be reconciled by explanations of the terms used.”* And yet he is not ignorant what the terms used really are. He is well aware that in the Church of Rome, it is both commonly said and firmly believed, that in the “sacrifice of the mass” the priest does offer Christ for the quick and dead, to have remission of pain or guilt. And he is equally well aware that the Church of England, in her Thirty-first Article, has stigmatized that sacrifice, and those masses as “blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits.” To put an end to this antagonism, and bring about the projected reconciliation, nothing more is needed than the adoption on our part of the doctrines and phraseology of Rome. Accordingly, to accustom the people to the familiar use of this phraseology, is now the constant aim of Dr Pusey’s school. The “Tracts for the Day” are full of it. The “Supper,” the “Minister,” the “Table,” have all disappeared ; and in their stead we are furnished with a “Sacrifice” (“The Dreadful Sacrifice”), a “Priest,” and an “Altar.” Instead of a Communion, ordained for the “*continual remembrance*” of the Great Sacrifice offered “once for all,” we have its continual repetition ; and the solemn warning of the Reformers, to “take heed lest of the memory we make a sacrifice,” is trampled under foot. “The Great Victim” is “offered” by human hands ; and this mock-sacrifice “is available for present, absent, living, dead ; yea, even for them that are yet unborn. In other words, . . . for the threefold divisions of the Church, militant, expectant, and triumphant—the faithful on earth, the saints departed, and the dead in general.”†

But who does not know how widely different from these vociferations uttered in her name is the language of the Church of England herself ! The very word “altar” is not to be found in her formularies. And this important fact is the result, not of accidental omission, but of intentional exclusion. In the First Prayer-Book of Edward VI. (1549), “altar” was employed with the most perfect consistency ; for then the “mass,” though in a modified form, was still in existence. But when, chiefly through the Latin Treatise of Johannes Scotus,‡ and the Saxon homily of Elfric of Malmesbury, against the materialistic heresy of the monk of Corby, Cranmer, not less than Ridley, had become convinced of the truth ; the “mass” was quickly abolished, and the Second Prayer-Book (1552) was the immediate result of this abolition. In every instance in which “altar” had been employed in the first Book, “table” was substituted in the second. Often simply “table,” sometimes the “holy

* “Eirenicon,” p. 28.

† “The Ritual Reason Why :” pp. 115, 135

‡ Commonly but erroneously attributed to Bertram.

table," five or six times "the Lord's Table," but never, in any single instance, is it again called "altar."

The word "priest," too, although found in the Prayer-Book, is never once used in the sense in which these tract-writers use it. The "priest" of the Prayer-Book is simply "presbyter" or "elder."* In the Rubrics, "priest" is simply synonymous with "minister." And the dishonest use of this term by the ritualists, in a sacerdotal sense, is by the Church's authoritative formularies most positively disavowed. In describing the priest of Rome, the Church of England calls him (on account of his sacrificial pretensions), "sacerdos," ("sacerdotem offerre Christum"), Art. XXXI.; but, disclaiming all such pretensions for her own "priests," as well as for those of the Catholic Church, properly so called, she designates them in the very next Article, and again in the Thirty-Sixth, as simply "presbyters." Not less conclusive, though not more authoritative than this, is the language of the Homily on the Lord's Supper: "Herein thou needest no other man's help . . . no sacrificing priest, no mass."

Our space will not allow us to enter upon the argument from Scripture.† We can therefore do no more than advert to the well-known fact, that while, in the New Testament, those "separated to the work of the ministry" are sometimes designated by titles denoting their dignity (*e. g.* "ambassadors," "heralds"), and more frequently by names expressive of their duty ("shepherds," "watchmen," "stewards," "servants," "nurses," "fishers," "labourers"), there is one term which, whatever be the theme—their dignity, responsibility, or duty—is carefully and significantly avoided. They are never once called "priests." The word (*ἱερεὺς*) uniformly applied to an Old Testament priest, is never, in a single instance, applied to a New Testament minister. Nor even in the early church was it ever so applied by the fathers of the first three centuries.

2. The logic of these "Essays" is peculiar. The same sentence which informs us that in a sacrament, the "two parts are inseparably united," tells us also what happens "when either part is absent." So that, after all, the parts are not "inseparable." With similar forgetfulness it is admitted (on p. 26), that the church is a "human power," although (on p. 22) it is so truly divine that persons "become children of God through being new-born of Holy Church." (!) That "generally" means "universally," is assumed as matter of course. It is asked (p. 16), "Why were Sacraments ordained, if they do

* Even Dr Hook admits this. "Church Dictionary," s. v.

† See Mr Bardsley's "Rubrics," pp. 50-58.

not convey the gift which belongs to them ?” But no notice is taken of the obvious answer. (1.) Your Seven Sacraments never were ordained ; and (2.) The gift you talk of never did belong to them. The frequent resort to “must” and “must be” is very remarkable. Thus, we are told, it is a mistake of “Protestant writers, that Peter Lombard was the first who fixed the number of sacraments at seven, which was afterwards confirmed by the Council of Trent ;” for (p. 4), “They *must** have been held as seven long before.” In the miracle, Mark vii. 32, “we cannot but perceive that there *must be** a certain virtue in the actions and the things used.” (p. 7.) We are to believe in the tremendous power and authority of the priesthood, because priests “*must** not only have a direct commission from Christ, but they *must have* also powers to carry out that commission.” (p. 28.) “*Stet pro ratione voluntas.*” In one place, indeed (p. 36), we are favoured with the *ratio* as well as the *voluntas*. “There *must** needs be the fullest powers in the priesthood to supply such grace as is needed for” “the whole work of salvation,” “and equally full powers to convey pardon to offenders.” Why ? For “Unless priests possess these powers, they have not the ministry of reconciliation committed to them ; “the priesthood is a mockery, the sacraments are a delusion, and the whole catholic church, since the death of the last apostle, St John, till now, has been one vast imposture ; and our own branch of the church is a profane deception, for it is built on the priestly and sacramental system equally with the rest.” (!)

3. The theology is peculiar. Sonship is by baptism. Lydia “was not regenerated, and did not receive the ‘new birth’ until she was baptized.” “In the preaching of St Peter, ‘the Holy Ghost fell on all them that heard the word ;’” yet they, too, not less than Lydia, according to our Essayist, were also unregenerate as long as they were unbaptized. That is to say, that although they had all “received the Holy Ghost, as well as the apostles at the Pentecost,” they had not received “the primary gift of life” (!) for “the new birth is a reception of the primary gift of life, itself preparatory to the reception of other gifts” (p. 47.) And this is his argument throughout. But St Paul’s argument, Rom. iv. 11, is just the contrary. Baptism, like circumcision, according to the apostle, is but the sign and seal of a character and relationship previously existing. In truth, however, the ritualist acquaintance with Holy Scripture is not greater than might be expected from men who have no cause to be partial to Scriptura. Among other illustrations of this in the tract before us, we have a soli-

tary text seven times repeated, to support the various claims advanced within the compass of twenty-two pages. And this without the faintest attempt at exegesis ; no pretence of reason for this multifarious application of a single prop ; no matter how diverse the subject, the treatment is the same ; when argument fails, the quotation must supply its place—“ As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you.”

The sacrifice of the mass is propped up in a similar manner. “ Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you.” “ Can words be plainer to shew the necessity of this sacrament for salvation ? ” (p. 74.) Of the reasons which have convinced even Romish divines that these words can have no reference to the Lord’s Supper, this writer (prudently) takes not the slightest notice. According to him, John vi. 54 secures the salvation not only of Judas, but of every murderer who runs from his victim to the Eucharist. For (according to the Essayist), the betrayer did eat that flesh, and drink that blood, which is inseparable from eternal life ; and yet, what saith the Scripture ? “ It had been good for that man if he had not been born ! ” Difficulties of this sort (*i. e.* difficulties springing out of this antiscriptural sacerdotalism), are treated with a Napoleonic disdain. “ There shall be no Alps ! ” Christ’s own most explicit declaration, “ The flesh profiteth nothing,” shall be swept utterly out of sight by the men who teach that the very reverse is true.

4. To instance but one other particular,—the Romanism of these productions is not the less intense for being unavowed. It is almost undisguised. It is greatly in advance of the “ Eirenicon.” We are dealing no longer with the thin end of the wedge, but with the wedge driven home. The “ Tracts for the Times ” were tentative ; the “ Tracts for the Day ” are authoritative but in both we have the same systematic and essential Popery. A sacerdotalism which, aiming at the elevation of the priesthood, issues in the degradation of the people. A materialism, dignified as sacramentalism, which, by sleight of hand and cunning craftiness, debases the divinest mysteries, and prostitutes “ the simplicity of the Gospel ” in honour of a paganised Christianity. This statement will not be thought too strong by those who observe the studied substitution of the priest in God’s stead ; the systematic “ teaching for doctrines the commandments of men ; ” and the contemptible puerilities of ritual service, which mark the publications of this school.

Here, for example, is a specimen or two from the “ Ritual Reason Why.” In the “ Low Celebration,” the prayer for the church militant is preceded by the “ Lavabo,” when “ the priest returns to the epistle corner of the altar, where the server pours a few drops of water over his fingers ” (p. 102). After

that, “Does the priest do anything else in preparation for consecration?” “Yes; he first separates his hands, and then gently rubs the thumb and forefinger of each within the corporal. He does so to free them from any grain of dust or other substance that may have adhered to them since the Lavabo, and also in token of reverence due to the sacred mysteries he is about to celebrate” (p. 119). When the celebration is over, and the people are dismissed, then follow “the ablutions.” “What are the ablutions? They are small quantities of wine and water which the server pours into the chalice, and which the priest consumes.” “How is the second ablution made? The priest sets the chalice down on the epistle corner of the altar, and holds the finger and thumb of each hand in the bowl of the chalice, while the server pours first a few drops of wine, and then a larger quantity of water, over his fingers into the chalice. The priest having wiped his fingers, then drinks the ablution”* (pp. 141, 142). Again (p. 128): “Is there not a custom of making a second fraction of the bread alter the consecration? Yes; the priest divides one of the halves, into which he broke the bread before consecration, into two unequal parts, the smaller of which he drops into the chalice. . . . The threefold division is held to symbolise the three divisions of the church at the time of our Lord’s resurrection,—the court of heaven,—the spirits in prison to whom our Lord preached (1 Peter iii. 19) in Hades, and the faithful on earth. The placing of the portion in the chalice is explained as symbolical of our Lord’s descent into hell, and also that the church militant is as it were plunged in the chalice, that is, made to partake of our Lord’s sufferings; or, as some explain it better, the separate consecration having typified the separation of our Lord’s body and soul in the act of death, this commixture is emblematical of their re-union at the resurrection.” “The Christian miracles,” says Jortin,† “may be referred to four periods. The first contains those that are recorded in the New Testament, and reaches to A.D. 70; of these there can be no doubt among Christians. . . . The last period is from Constantine to when you please, and abounds with miracles, the defence of which shall be left to those who are inclined to undertake it, at the hazard of misapplying their pains;” a sentence equally true of the ritualistic efforts at “symbolising.” Everything means

* When we first saw this prescription, and saw it enjoined, too, as it is, as being necessary in order to the “integrity of the sacrifice,” we instinctively called to mind a well known prescription in the “*Skanda Purana* :”—“Let the wife who wishes to perform sacred ablution wash the feet of her lord, and drink the water; for a husband is to a wife greater than Shankara or Vishnu.”

† Vol. ii. p. 82.

something, but what that something is no one knows.* But the contrariety of reasons assigned for the same practices is partly compensated by the unanimity of the determination to invent dogmas without reason. The mysterious virtue of the number seven is an instance. They find it everywhere. It is a veritable “Abracadabra.” Aquinas and the Florentine fathers maintaining seven sacraments on the ground of natural analogies, and Peter Dens, who found them in the seven pillars of the house of Wisdom (Prov. ix. 1), were far behind their modern imitators. Just as “the scholastics have divided Hades into four divisions,”† so there are four “cardinal virtues,—fortitude, justice, prudence, temperance;” but these are merely “heathen virtues,” until the mystic number is completed by the addition of “faith, hope, and charity.” “There is a priesthood on earth, and a priesthood in heaven,—the one a pattern of the other.”‡ In heaven “we see an angel offering incense, and six others, making up the mystic number of the deacons.” And on earth the “three greater orders are complemented by the ‘four inferior orders.’” In the model miracle (Mark vii. 32), “we shall see seven distinct actions.” And, “besides the absence of publicity,”§ there are seven “other causes which make void a marriage.”

To turn from these “Tracts for the Day” to the manly reasoning of Mr Bardsley and Canon Boyd, is most refreshing. “Mind your Rubrics,” its author tells us, “was written to defend and preserve God’s truth as held and maintained by the Church of England.” The reception it has met with must leave him well assured that it has not been written in vain.

* Thus, “The sign of the cross is a short creed in action. . . . For, first, we place our hand to our forehead, *in the name of the Father*, who is God over all; then to the bottom of the breast, *and of the Son*, who humbled himself even to the death of the cross; and, lastly, from the left to the right side, *and of the Holy Ghost*, who proceedeth both from Father and from Son. Or, as the ‘Myrroure’ explains it, by the sign of the cross we express our belief that ‘our Lord Jesus Christ came down from *the Head*, that is, the Father, unto earth by his holy incarnation; and from the earth unto the *left side*, that is hell, by his bitter passion; and from thence to his Father’s *right side* by his glorious ascension’” (*Ritual Reason Why*, p. 67). And “the amice” is equally “interpreted as representing the linen rag wherewith the Jews blindfolded our Saviour;” and “also as a type of the helmet of salvation, wherewith the good soldier of Jesus Christ is equipped” (*Ibid.* p. 19).

† “(1.) Hell for the damned; (2.) The prison-house for children dying without baptism; (3.) The prison-house or limbus, for the old fathers, which was emptied by Christ; (4.) Purgatory for those who have not paid the whole debt of punishment due to their sins in life” (*Tracts for the Day*, No. 2, Purgatory, p. 28).

‡ *The Seven Sacraments*, p. 81.

§ “Those who marry in secret are not joined together by God, neither is their matrimony lawful” (*Ibid.* p. 21).

Its peculiar merit is the success with which it dislodges the ritualists from their entrenchments behind the rubrics. It completely turns the position. The flagrant dishonesty of those who adopt for their ideal the "Directorium Anglicanum," while professing to take their stand on the rubrics, is conclusively shewn from the rubrics themselves. While the condemnation which awaits the pretensions of sacerdotalism at the bar of Scripture, of reason, of experience, is by no means overlooked, the one prominent feature is the abundant demonstration of the fact that, notwithstanding their pretentious professions, "the Catholic School" stand convicted by their deeds of disloyalty to the Church of England.

In Canon Boyd's book we have the same important fact shewn with the same conclusiveness, although, from the wider range of subjects discussed, it appears with perhaps less prominence. The force and power of the book may be measured by the irritation it has caused, and the amount of reviling it has incurred. Its strong point is its very able discussion of the nature of the "Real Presence." And this, after all, is the very heart of the controversy. This is the crucial question. This is the cardinal point. On this everything turns. If, on this point, the Church of England really taught what these ritualists pretend, it would be impossible to deny the truth of the assertion, that the differences are merely verbal which separate us from Rome.

But does the Church of England thus teach? One would have supposed that her history had made the question itself impossible. Who does not know that her martyrs went to the stake for asserting that bread was bread, and that no popish "hocus pocus" could make it anything else? The confusion of thought which dreams of a Presence "incarnate," yet not corporeal," is not hers. She knows nothing of the refinements which not only pretend the possibility, but are even obtuse enough to assert the reality of, the "supra-local" presence of a "body." On the contrary, she declares, in plain words, "It is against the truth of Christ's natural body to be at one time in more places than one."* Against the assertion of a bodily

* Declaration at the end of the Communion Office. The history of this Declaration shews most clearly the *animus imponentis*. In the original "Order in Council," 1552, instead of the words "corporal presence," there was "real and essential presence." By Queen Elizabeth, 1559, the declaration was withdrawn altogether. But, though omitted from the prayer book, it was by no means forgotten, for Bishops Grindall and Horne, in 1567, say that it continued to be "most diligently declared, published, and impressed upon the people" (*Zurich Letters*, lxxv. vol. i. p. 180 [Parker Soc.]). In 1662, it was restored to its place (but not printed as a rubric), with the substitution of "corporal" for "real and essential." Concurrent with this is the history of the 28th article; for, in the reign of Edward VI., that article had a long paragraph

profitably to his soul's health, although he do not receive the sacrament with his mouth.”* What more explicit declaration can we have, that the presence of Christ is not in the elements, but in the heart of the faithful receiver?

It is important to observe, too, that the leaders of this popish party, when charged with the Tridentine character of their teaching, are careful not to repudiate the charge. Some of them make it their boast; few ever give it denial. This indeed is “necessary for their position.” Witness the avowed objects of the “E.C.U.” and the “A.P.U.C.!” Hence such frank admissions as those of Mr Mackonochie:—“But, people tell you, all this must end in your becoming members of the Roman communion. In answer to this I honestly tell you, that if a man has no stronger ground against Rome than some contest about what he calls “Catholic and Protestant,” or some isolated doctrines, however important, I can easily imagine his going to Rome in these days of convulsion in the spiritual world. Indeed, if he be an earnest man, *it is difficult to see where else he is to find a rest!*” We have italicised the last words for the sake of the question they suggest. Is it possible to recommend popery in stronger terms than these? But this is not all, for we are further told that, as against other churches, the Church of England “takes her stand, not on Acts of Parliament, or a royal injunction, or even a purer faith, or greater manifestation of the spiritual life—all this might one day fail her.” What then? why this: when she has apostatised from her “purer faith” and lost her “manifestation of the spiritual life,” she will still be “the only church in the world which can claim the joint British and Saxon succession!” So that the rising tide of popery is to be checked, if checked at all, by the Canute of St Albans, sitting on the shore and timidly waving the wand of an unacknowledged and unreal “succession!”

It were idle to quote 2 Tim. ii. 2, or to talk of the “succession” of apostolic doctrine as an integral and essential constituent of apostolic succession, to men who are so superbly superior to all considerations which affect merely “a purer faith.” Were it otherwise, we might appeal to that very British and Saxon Church whose authority our opponents profess to claim. We will not cite the testimony of the Culdees; that would be too British—for (in the words of St Bernard) they “rejected auricular confession, as well as authoritative absolution,” and therefore cannot possibly find favour with the authorities at St Albans. We will content ourselves with a Saxon authority of the tenth century. Elfric, a con-

* *Frater in hoc casu sufficit tibi vera fides et bona voluntas; tantum crede, et manducasti.*” (*Maskell, Mon. Rit. i. p. 89.*)

temporary of St Dunstan, and an ecclesiastic of much celebrity, in a letter which, as it was addressed to Wulfstan, Archbishop of York, and at the request of that prelate, translated into the vernacular tongue, must be admitted as a document of no mean authority, expressly says, the “housel (host) is Christ’s body, not bodily, but spiritually. Not the body which he suffered in, but the body of which he spake when he blessed the bread and wine, a night before his sufferings. The apostle has said of the Hebrews, that they all did eat of the same ghostly meat, and they all did drink of the same ghostly drink. And this he said, not bodily, but ghostly. Christ being not yet born, nor his blood shed, when that the people of Israel ate that meat, and drank of that stone. And the stone was not (a stone) bodily, though he so said. It was the same mystery in the old law, and they did ghostly signify that gospel housel of our Saviour’s body which we consecrate now.” In a homily by this same Elfric, “appointed in the reign of the Saxons, to be spoken to the people at Easter,” the allusion to the manna and the rock in the wilderness is repeated; the bread in the sacrament is said to be no more the body of Christ than the water of baptism may be said to be the Holy Spirit; the body which is hallowed in the bread is not that in which Christ suffered, for this latter was born of Mary, while the other is formed from a gathering together of many corns, and that “nothing therefore is to be understood therein bodily, but all is to be understood ghostly;” and this series of distinctions the writer brings to a close, by observing that the signs appealing to the senses in the eucharist are a pledge and figure of truth, while the body of Christ is truth itself.* It was for disinterring this truth from the grave of popish doctrine, where it had been buried under “many superstitions,” that papal inquisitors wreaked their impotent wrath on the bones of that grand old lion, Wycliffe. “For thus Christ saith, ‘*This is my body,*’ and these words must be taken as the words about the Baptist—‘And if you will receive it, *this is Elias*’ Christ does not, to avoid equivocation, contradict the Baptist when he declares, ‘I am *not* Elias.’ The one means to say that he *was* Elias *figuratively*, the other that he was *not* Elias *personally*. And so in the case of those who admit that this sacrament is *not* naturally the body of Christ, but insist that it is figuratively Christ’s body, there is in reality no contradiction, but simply the use of the same words in two senses.”† And again: “You

* “A Testimonie of Antiquitie, shewing the ancient faythe in the Church of England touching the sacrament of the body and blood of the Lord, here publicly preached, and also received in the Saxon tyme, above six hundred years ago. Printed by John Day, beneath St Martyn’s. Cum privilegio Regie Maiestatis, 1587.

† Trialogus, b. iv. c. 8.

know not what you ask, or what you do. For if ye did, ye would not blaspheme God as you do, setting up an alien God instead of the living God. Christ saith, 'I am a very (true) vine.' Wherefore do ye not worship the vine for God, as ye do the bread? Wherein was Christ a very (true) vine? Or wherein was the bread Christ's body? It was in *figurative* speech, which is hidden to the understanding of sinners."* How exactly this language is the language of the formularies of the Church of England appears, on comparing it with the most authoritative expositions of those formularies. To take, *e. g.*, a single instance: "By *real* we understand *true*, in opposition both to fiction and imagination; and to those shadows that were in the Mosaical dispensation. . . . In this sense, we acknowledge a *real presence* of Christ in the sacrament; though we are convinced that our first Reformers judged right concerning the use of the phrase *real presence*, that it was better to be let fall than to be continued, since the use of it, and that idea which does naturally arise from the common acceptance of it, may stick deeper, and feed superstition more, than all those longer explanations that are given to it can be able to cure."†

But the "real presence"—where is it? Do we deny the maxim of St Ambrose, "Ubi corpus, ibi Christus"? By no means. But his presence as the God-man is by the Holy Ghost; "and of the Holy Ghost place is not predicted, save in the souls of the faithful." "I mean not that Christ is spiritually either on the table, or in the bread and wine that is set on the table. . . . No more truly is he corporeally or really present in the due ministration of the Lord's Supper, than he is in the due ministration of baptism."‡ "The real presence of Christ's most blessed body and blood is not therefore to be sought in the sacrament, but in the worthy receiver of the sacrament. . . . I see not which way it should be gathered by the words of Christ, when and where the bread is his body, or the cup his blood; but *only* in the very heart and soul of him that receiveth him."§ For "the grace of God is not necessarily tied to the sacrament;"|| and "the bread and wine are not the true body and blood of Christ, but the sign

* Concluding paragraph of Wycliffe's "Wyckett."

† Burnet: Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles, Art. 28. In this work—however it may commonly be undervalued—Burnet has a *consensus* of archbishops, bishops, "and a great many learned divines," from Jewel to Tillotson, to which no other expositor has any pretension. (See his Preface). Those, however, who seek something still more authoritative, may find it in the decision of the Arches Court, in the case of "Ditcher v. Denison."

‡ Abp. Cranmer: Answer to Gardiner.

§ Hooker: "Eccl. Pol." b. v. c. 67.

|| Whitgift: "Against Cartwright."

and token of them.”* “So great a difference is there between the sacrament and the body of Christ. The sacrament passeth into the belly, Christ’s body passeth into the soul. The sacrament is upon earth, Christ’s body is in heaven. The sacrament is corruptible, Christ’s body is glory. The sacrament is the sign, Christ’s body is the thing signified.”† In a word, the efficacy of the “effectual signs” “acknowledged by the Church of England, is not the ‘ex opere operato’ of the Church of Rome, or the more intellectual impression of the Church of Zurich,‡ but a spiritual benefit, the force and virtue of which depend subjectively on the moral condition of the recipient.”§ And that spiritual benefit we may well expect to possess in increasing measure while we maintain—not the vain attempt to repeat a sacrifice offered “once for all,” but—“the perpetual memory of that his precious death, until his coming again.”

But we have fallen on perilous times. This alone has induced us to point again to the old paths. The battle of the Reformation, in England, has to be fought over again. “The whole purpose of the great revival has been to eliminate the dreary Protestantism of the Hanoverian period, and restore the glory of Catholic worship; the churches are restored after the mediæval pattern, and our ritual must accord with the Catholic standard.” Such is the plain declaration of “The Church and the World,” endorsed by a bishop;|| nor does it stand alone. Speaking in Convocation, in February of last year, the Bishop of Llandaff said, “I cannot but consider this a Rome-ward movement, and a very rapid movement.” And the Bishop of St David’s, with his usual well-weighed and weighty words, says, “Nothing, in my judgment, can be more mischievous, as well as in more direct contradiction to notorious facts, than to deny or ignore the Rome-ward movement.” Let it be well understood from the minute instructions of the *Directorium Anglicanum* what Ritualism really is. Let Archdeacon Denison¶ be heard avowing that Ritualism means “belief in the doc-

* Abp. Ussher; “Body of Divinity.” Cf., too, Art. XXV. on sacraments as “Effectual Signs;” and Wycliffe’s First Proposition in his Challenge to the University of Oxford (1381): “Hostia consecrata quam videmus in Altari nec est Christus nec aliqua sui pars sed efficax ejus signum.”

† Bp. Jewel: “Defence of the Apology,” p. 222.

‡ It is hardly necessary to observe that, while differing from Zuingli, the Church of England is (at least on this question) in close agreement with the great Genevan Reformer. Yet it is refreshing in days like these to read again, “Institutionis, lib. iv.,” especially such portions as section 15 of chapter xiv. (De externis mediis ad salutem), on St Augustine’s distinction, “inter Sacramentum et rem Sacramenti.”

§ Canon Boyd: “Confession, Absolution, and The Real Presence,” p. 188.

|| Salisbury: On presenting the book to the Upper House of Convocation.

¶ “Ritualism and the Real Presence: a Letter to the Lord Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol.” Rivingtons.

28 *The Eastern Question—Its Religious Bearings.*

trine of the real presence," and that that doctrine, as propounded by Ritualists, "is the life of the Church of England." Let it be remembered that "already there are 2000 churches which have lights on the altars;" that even now the position of the Ritualists is deemed almost "impregnable," and that they ask only for two years more to make good their ground against the bench of bishops and both Houses of Parliament. With these facts clearly in view, we anticipate confidently the full concurrence of our readers in the weighty words of warning with which we conclude:—

"Looking at the lengths to which the Anti-Reformation party has gone, and its evident determination to go further, and the means of carrying out this purpose which it possesses, I cannot resist the conviction that at no time since the Reformation did the church stand in such danger of corruption or division, or rather of both,—of being first deeply corrupted, and then rent asunder."*

Σ.

ART. II.—*The Eastern Question—Its Religious Bearings.*

SOME little time ago, London had a duty to itself and to the empire to perform—in other words, the obligation was laid upon it of giving a befitting reception to quite an array of guests, who came seeking its hospitality. First, there was the Viceroy of Egypt, with his retainers; next, there arrived two thousand and more Belgian volunteers; and last, though very far indeed from being least, Abdul Aziz, the Sultan of Constantinople, appeared, with his son and a distinguished retinue. So old flags were brought from the places where they had been carefully folded past, and new ones were manufactured in large numbers: the special demand being for the Turkish colours—a white crescent, partly enclosing a star of the same hue, all on a background of red; and those of Belgium—a tricolor of blue, yellow, and red, reminding one of the French flag, but differing from it in this respect, that its central compartment is yellow, where that of France is white. The interior of Charing Cross railway terminus, at the advent of the Sultan, was quite a spectacle, beautifully decorated as it was with shrubs, and flowers, and red cloth, with the monotony of its colour relieved by glittering crescents and stars. Outside, among the numbers numberless that stood around, might be dis-

* "Charge" of the Bishop of Ossory, 1866. Macmillan.

cerned Mussulmans in as thoroughly oriental dresses as any that could be seen at Grand Cairo or Aurungabad, who had crept forth from their ordinary lurking-places to witness the reception given to the head of their faith. For more than a week thereafter, it appeared as if London were keeping high festival, and had turned all its great talent for business in the direction of joy and festivity. They have gone those visitors now, one and all of them, carrying, we hope, and really believe, favourable impressions of this country to their respective lands. As is natural, public attention will for some time be turned to the affairs of the regions whence they came, and specially to Turkey, whose history has at all times been of world-wide interest; and for whose sake, at a period comparatively recent, we waged a terrible war.

Even if the Sultan and the Viceroy had not thought of visiting our shores, the eastern question would still have forced itself anew on public notice, owing to the events which have, for so considerable a period, been transpiring in Candia. For a long time after the Crimean campaign terminated, the British mind, which had had quite a surfeit of Russian and Turkish affairs, would hear no more of the subject; and, to superficial observers, it might have appeared as if, notwithstanding all that had occurred, the great struggle would soon be as completely forgotten as an ordinary nine days' wonder, and would point a moral in regard to the transient influence of even the most Herculean efforts put forth by our race. But, when reflection is brought to bear on the subject, what stands prominently forth is not the vanity, but the exceeding importance, of man's affairs. There is an eternity about the consequences of human action; and though one, thoroughly fatigued by the length of time a great historic drama may have occupied in enacting, may for a little banish the whole subject from his mind, yet, sooner or later, it will be sure to recur; the actors will again present themselves, and anew excite attention; and the topic, of which one wished to hear no more, will stand forth as fresh and fascinating in its interest as at the first.

It is the object of the present article to examine the religious bearings of the Eastern question, now again beginning to loom large; and if we find it difficult in all cases to disentangle the political from the religious element, and therefore feel it necessary, to a certain extent, to treat of both, happily the subject is one which does not much divide parties in England, and which, therefore, there is less impropriety in taking up as part of a missionary inquiry in a theological review.

It tends very much to clear the way for accurate reasoning, if one, in mathematical fashion, first define his terms. And oft is it found that, when he attempts to do so, he discovers that apparently simple words almost defy clear explanation. The late Sir Robert Peel is reported to have asked doubtfully, "What is a pound?" on which the multitudes, who thought they knew, felt it very difficult to give an answer. The *Times* recently asked, "What is an average?" and felt puzzled what reply to render. And when one wishes precisely to define the term Turkey, unexpected obstacles present themselves in his way. We have no doubt that some will sneer at the assertion; as, for example, that Londoner of prosaic mind whom, at the first coming of the Viceroy of Egypt, we observed to have hung out of his window a flag, with a representation of the bird called a turkey sewn upon it; but others will wait till they learn the nature of the doubt. It is with regard to the extent of the Turkish empire,—what countries formerly overrun by the Ottomans are to be considered as still belonging to it, and which are to be held as now entirely independent of its sway. A year or two ago a person sent a letter to the *Times* newspaper drawing attention to the enormous area which a geographical work of reputation which he had consulted assigned to the Turkish dominion, and asking some correspondent to explain to him the reason why. No notice was taken of his letter, on which he again came forward and repeated his inquiry, yet still all was in vain. The explanation sought so fruitlessly was really simple. Its principle should have been stated in some such language as this:—That just as the Papacy still considers itself to possess a claim upon every square mile of territory, of which the inhabitants at any previous period acknowledged allegiance to the "Successor of St Peter;" or just as in front of some Bibles we find "the Most High and Mighty Prince" James styled "by the grace of God King of Great Britain, *France*, and Ireland," though our temporary occupation of the north of France had centuries before come to an end; even so does Turkey claim as its own most of the territories conquered by the Ottomans, at the period when their warlike spirit was at the greatest, even though the inhabitants of those lands may have long since been successful in either wholly or partially achieving their independence. When France shewed a not unnatural jealousy of our establishing ourselves on the Isle of Perim, in the straits of Babel-Mandeb, suddenly a third party appeared upon the scene; in other words, Turkey, of whom no one had seriously thought in connection with a spot so far from Constantinople,

intimated that the Isle of Perim really belonged to her. Some years previously a similar claim had been made with respect to Algeria,—the French occupation of that part of northern Africa being regarded as an invasion of *Turkish* rights. In these circumstances there is the same difficulty in stating the precise area of Turkey as there is in estimating the dimensions of a cloud, which, defined enough in certain directions, in others shades gently away into the azure of the sky. We think geographers are right in giving Turkey a very extensive area; and no error will arise if it be remembered that while, in some provinces in or near the original seat of the Ottoman empire,—Asia Minor,—its rule is substantial as a yoke of iron; in other places more remote from that centre, it is thin and impalpable as a summer cloud. In the new edition of Dr Keith Johnston's "Gazetteer," revised to August 1864, from which we have taken a considerable portion of the statistics in this article, the area of Turkey is stated to be 1,834,669 square miles, that is, about the same as that of Russia in Europe, considerably more than that of all India, or about fifteen times that of Great Britain and Ireland. No wonder that the inquirer already spoken of was startled on encountering a half civilised dominion of so portentous a magnitude. The population of this vast region is, comparatively speaking, but small, amounting only, by the census of 1844, to 37,430,000; that is, about the same as that of France, and only 7½ millions more than that of Britain. A brief abstract of Dr Johnston's elaborate statistical table may be presented:—

	Area.	Population.
Proximate Possessions in Europe,	138,203	10,500,000
"Tributary States"—Moldavia and Wallachia, now together called Roumania; Servia, and Monte- negro,	71,824	5,230,000
Possessions in Europe,	210,027	15,730,000
Asia Minor, or Anatolia, with Cyprus,	208,370	10,700,000
Armenia and Kurdistan, . . .	120,980	1,700,000
Syria,	146,070	2,750,000
Arabia (part of),	193,700	900,000
Possessions in Asia,	669,120	16,050,000
Egypt, Nubia, Dongola, Sennaar, } with Meröe,	577,480	3,850,000
Tripoli, with Barca and Fez, . .	299,160	1,500,000
Tunis,	78,882	800,000
Possessions in Africa,	955,522	5,650,000
TOTAL,	1,834,669	37,430,000

32 *The Eastern Question—Its Religious Bearings.*

When these numbers come to be studied, the area of the empire ceases to present the very formidable aspect it did at first. Nearly one-third of it is taken up with the valley of the Nile, in which, if we except the Delta, there is little more than a narrow belt of vegetation along the river bank, with barren rocks and sands, relieved here and there by a solitary oasis; a territory, in short, which, though it may figure imposingly when its extent in square miles is stated, must yet be less important than it looks, inasmuch as only a limited portion of its wide expanse can be properly inhabited by man.

The geographer already quoted thus states the division according to creeds in European and Asiatic Turkey:—

	In Europe.	In Asia.	Total.
Mussulmans,	4,550,000	12,650,000	21,000,000
Greeks and Armenians,	10,000,000	800,000	18,000,000
Catholics,	640,000	260,000	900,000
Jews,	70,000	80,000	105,000
	<hr/> 15,260,000	<hr/> 13,290,000	<hr/> 35,000,000

It will be perceived that this table is not taken from the same source as was the census, for it makes the population of European and Asiatic Turkey somewhat greater than did the statistics formerly given. Nor can the figures, even of the most careful and conscientious statist, be depended on with complete confidence, when the science to which he devotes himself has made so little progress as it has in Turkey up to the present time. It is needful, before proceeding further, to add the numbers professing the two creeds, now mentioned, in Egypt, the chief African possession of Turkey. There is a remarkable unanimity of opinion in regard to the number of the Copts in Egypt. It is generally stated at from 150,000 to 200,000, in other words, there are that number of native Egyptian Christians among perhaps 2,700,000 Mahomedans. Presuming that the numbers professing Christianity or Mahomedanism in the leading provinces of Turkey, are stated with at least a faint approach to accuracy, they lay the basis for a correct understanding of the probable religious future in store for Turkey. Let us pass in review the various races professing the two great antagonistic faiths.

And, first, let us glance at the Turkish race and history. Away in Central and Eastern Asia, ethnographers have long recognised the existence of a variety of mankind to which the name of Mongolian or Turanian has been applied. The Chinese belong to it; so do the Tartars, the low castes of India, and many other nations or tribes. Though the Turks

have greatly improved in physical aspect, partly by passing from nomad to settled life, partly by intermarriage with Circassians and others, yet they were originally of the Turanian race, and so much akin to the Tartars that it is difficult to say which was the precise distinction between the two. Indeed, some ethnologists have virtually abolished the term Tartar (or Tatar it should have been, for the *r* was intercalated in the middle ages, to support the hypothesis that the people of whose barbarities Europe was then afraid, came originally from Tartarus). When the term now spoken of is discarded, then, for Chinese Tartary on maps of Asia is substituted Chinese Turkestan, and for Independent Tartary Independent Turkestan. But whatever nomenclature be adopted, certain it is that hordes, in language and in physical peculiarities almost completely akin to the Turks, as they were when they first appeared in Europe, roam over all those regions; or, if more civilised, inhabit their few and scattered towns. Some believe that the old Scythians, spoken of by Herodotus and others, were of this race. The Burgundians, the Huns, the Chazars, the Avars, and other heathen tribes, which were at one period or another so troublesome to the Eastern Empire, are held on satisfactory evidence to have been of Turkish descent. The brilliant conquests of the Arabs, after Mahomed had woke up their ardour, temporarily drove back the Turkish pressure towards the west and south, and for a little the Saracens ruled both at Samarcand and at Bokhara. But ultimately the Turks did for the Arab-Mussulman empire in the East what the northern barbarians did for that of the Romans in the West, that is, they overthrew its political power; and then, discarding their heathenism, embraced the faith of those whom they had subdued. A superior has always a tendency to displace an inferior faith, and the Moslem religion triumphed in this case, because it was nearer the truth than the rude heathenism hitherto professed by the Turkish hordes. As first one, and then another, and another Turkish tribe gained the mastery, the tide of invasion rolled nearer and nearer to Europe. By the time that the tribe called Oghuzes had been succeeded by that termed Seljuks, the important province of Asia Minor was, to a large extent, lost to the Greek Empire; this was in the latter half of the 11th century. When, at the commencement of the 14th, the Seljuks were displaced by the Ottomans, a new and yet more ominous period for the Byzantine empire was commencing. From Othman, or Osman, who founded the Turkish empire, properly so called, and from whom the Turks are called

34 *The Eastern Question—Its Religious Bearings.*

Osmanlis or Ottomans, that is, from the year A.D. 1288, on to the period of the Reformation, nay, even for half a century beyond it, there was scarcely a Turkish Sultan that was not an able man and a conqueror; and even down to a recent period, the public spirit among the now extinct Janisseries or Pretorians of the Turkish dominion was so great, that a sultan who was unsuccessful in war was almost sure to be deposed, if not imprisoned or assassinated. In 1354, the Turks for the first time managed to possess themselves of a fragment of territory in Europe. Seven years later, Adrianople was captured. The first siege of Constantinople by the Turks was in 1391; a great part of what is now called Turkey in Europe having before this fallen into their hands. During the next sixty years, they inflicted numerous and dreadful defeats on the Christian princes, either singly or combined, till at length, as is well known, in 1453, they gained the great prize—Constantinople. By about 1479, the conquest of Greece was complete. Between 1500 and 1517, most of Asiatic Turkey with Egypt were added, and pertinacious efforts began to push the Moslem conquests through Hungary and Austria into the very heart of Europe. Since the middle of the 16th century, the general course of the great Ottoman empire has been downward: and in this respect it has but followed the course of every Mahomedan dominion in the world. For a little, a Moslem conqueror, or a series of Moslem conquerors, may put forth almost resistless power; but in a little their dominion begins to fall to pieces, and no possibility of reviving it can be found. And why? Because more than fighting is required to establish a durable empire. That high regard for justice, and for other virtues which is rarely seen in any force except in lands irradiated by the gospel, is one primary necessity: intellectual enlightenment, with a desire to help instead of hinder human progress is another. And how little of these have ever been apparent even in the best days of the Turkish dominion! The Ottoman power still met with much respect in Britain, on account of its martial prowess at the time when its administration of justice was so much of a byword that, as will be remembered, Shakespeare, referring to the accession of Henry V. of England, has the following:—

Enter King Henry the Fifth, attended.

Chief-Justice. Good-morrow, and God save your majesty!

King. This new and gorgeous garment, majesty,

Sits not so easy on me as you think.

Brothers, you mix your sadness with some fear.

This is the English, not the Turkish court,

Not Amurath an Amurath succeeds,

But Harry, Harry.—(Henry IV. Act V. Scene 2.)

During the whole time of the Ottoman rule in Europe, the weak point about the Turks has been their proneness to tyrannise over the Christians under them; while, on the contrary, they have had this redeeming quality, if it can be called one, that they have always shewn a readiness to answer for their misdeeds on the field of battle; like those American editors, probably fabulous, who are said to commence their literary life by furnishing themselves with a revolver, and intimating that they are ready to give satisfaction (!) to all whom their writings may aggrieve.

There is a significant narrative bearing on the subject in Sir Samuel's Baker's *Albert Nyanza*, sometime ago noticed in these pages. After that intrepid traveller had been oftener than once deceived by commercial parties about to ascend the Nile, who had promised to allow him to accompany them, he resolved no longer to suffer himself to be mocked, but simply to join the next party of traders, and go with them, whether they desired his presence or not. The caravan on which he ultimately inflicted his company, proved to be a Turkish one, which for some days threatened his life, but at last became half reconciled; so that night by night his camp, surmounted by the British flag, and the Turkish one, a red ensign with a white star and crescent, were pitched in close proximity to each other. The Turks misbehaved all along the road, and at last stirred up such excitement among the native Africans, that at a certain village unmistakeable symptoms appeared of a disposition to attack the travellers. On this Baker sent for the chief man of the village, convinced him that the Englishman at least had no sympathy with the perpetrators of outrage, and finally obtained from him a promise that every effort should be made to allay the excitement among his subjects. The chief, however, failed in his endeavour, and the negroes, whose intellect appears to have been none of the brightest, inaugurated their attempt to surprise the camp, while the defenders slept, by loudly beating their *nogara* or war-drum, to summon the villagers to arms. The moment the *nogara* ceased, the Turkish drum responded, and it was manifest to the assailing party that the time for surprising the camps was past. So the villagers, foiled in their project, gave vent to their mortification by beating the *nogara* at intervals during the night; but however frequently they might do it, they found that the moment it ceased, the Turkish drum answered the challenge, as it had done at the beginning; and thus the whole hours of darkness passed away. Here we have the Turkish character to the life, both on its bad and on its good side. On the

one hand, we have a proneness to trample on the rights of others, and a remarkable indisposition to make apology, even when apology is clearly due ; on the other hand, there is a willingness to take the full responsibility of its actions, and, at any peril to itself, attempt, by passing through the ordeal of battle, to meet the responsibility of the evil deeds it has done. How like that scene in the valley of the Nile was the opening one of the great Russo-Turkish drama some fourteen years ago. There is no doubt that the Moslem oppression practised on Greek Christians, co-religionists of such a power as Russia, was not merely wicked, like all persecution, but it was to the last degree imprudent. If Turkey had been betrayed into such indefensible conduct, it should have made a humble apology, and promised amendment, long before the storm began to gather. But, as in the case of Baker's friends, proper apology there was none. But most characteristically, when, under the auspices of Prince Menshikoff, what may be called the Russian *nogara* began to beat loud and defiantly, the instant response of the Turkish drum brought on the struggle which nearly all the diplomatists of Europe were at the time doing their best to prevent. It will be remembered that it was not Russia which declared war against Turkey, it was Turkey that did so against Russia, and that notwithstanding advices to the contrary, on the part of its two western allies.

The Turks constitute but a small portion of the ruling race in some provinces or dependencies of their empire ; in Egypt for example, and in parts of Asiatic Turkey, the Mus-sulman population belongs in large measure to the Arab race.

It is needful to pass next in review the subject of Christian nations or portions of nations. And first the Greeks, perhaps 200,000, of whom are believed to exist in Constantinople itself. It is a characteristic of the southern races to be precocious, that is, to reach maturity at an early period, an advantage attended by this very serious drawback, that the powers which ripen so soon, ere long begin to decay. It has been the same with the southern races as with the individuals of whom these consist. The most brilliant epoch in the development of each southern race has been at a comparatively early period of the world's history ; and decay has set in soon, and has not again given place to rejuvenescence. Never does a family fall from the ranks of the aristocracy without a longing to resume its old position ; and never does a nation sink, after an epoch of world-wide renown, without being for ever afterwards haunted by the remembrance of the departed period of splendour which it continually seeks

to restore. But in this world, glory does not come simply for the wishing, and it is often found that, when degeneracy has proceeded to a certain length, the nation makes no vigorous effort to rise from the depths into which it has fallen, but allows the vision of a lost paradise to remain a vision and nothing more. So frequently is this melancholy phenomenon witnessed, that it is held by many as an unquestionable truth, that a nation which once lapses from high estate, falls for ever, unless assisted in its efforts to rise again by foreign aid. We are not disposed to take quite so unfavourable a view. The loss of the masculine virtues courage and its associated qualities, may be repaired, if a fallen race is driven to the mountains; while residence on the plain may so sap the vigour of the conquerors, that they may become unfit to reign, and finally be displaced by a descent of the older people banished for a season to the hills. Though the Italians have to a certain extent been aided from without in achieving their independence, yet the regeneration of Italy, so far as it has yet proceeded, has been mainly from within; and it is interesting to note that the spot whence the ripple-wave of liberty was set in motion was the mountain territory of Piedmont, not many miles from that region—the geological axis of the European continent, where alp towers on alp, and the gigantic Monte Rosa and Mont Blanc raise their heads amid eternal snows.

Is Greece capable of rising in a similar manner? Somewhat less than half a century ago, the answer returned to the question was almost sure to be enthusiastically affirmative; though actual contact with the Greeks, even during the period of their life and death struggle for severance from Turkey, had a considerable effect in damping the ardour that had been felt before experience was gained. The revulsion of feeling in the mind of Byron, as all are aware, was such as to tinge the references to Greece in his poetry, as for instance in the following verses of exquisite beauty, put into the mouth of a native bard:—

“ ’Tis something in the dearth of fame,
Though link’d among the fetter’d race,
To feel at least a patriot’s shame,
Even as I sing, suffuse my face;
For what is left the poet here?
For Greeks a blush—for Greece a tear.

“ Must *we* but weep o’er days more blest?
Must *we* but blush?—Our fathers bled.
Earth! render back from out thy breast
A remnant of our Spartan dead!
Of the three hundred grant but three,
To make a new Thermopylæ!

38 *The Eastern Question—Its Religious Bearings.*

“ What, silent still ? and silent all ?
 Ah, no :—the voices of the dead
 Sound like a distant torrent’s fall,
 And answer, ‘ Let one living head,
 But one, arise—we come, we come ! ’
 ’Tis but the living who are dumb.

“ In vain—in vain ; strike other chords :
 Fill high the cup with Samian wine !
 Leave battles to the Turkish hordes,
 And shed the blood of Scio’s vine !
 Hark ! rising to the ignoble call,
 How answers each bold Bacchanal ? ”

It is now possible to look at the matter with more calmness than could be done at the time when the poet wrote. It is a happy omen for Greece that it has retained so tenaciously the memory of its former greatness, and proposed to itself an object so large as the reconstruction of the old Byzantine empire. It is a favourable circumstance too, that Greece should be so grandly mountainous a country, where the martial virtues are in the very nature of things indigenous, and in the event of a national cause being lost, ready succour and refuge can be afforded to the vanquished. When the writer of this article was sailing along the coast of Greece, he was particularly struck with the mountainous character of the country. Thus within that section of the Peloponnesus of old termed Messene, he saw snow on the top of a mountain, though it was the 8th of July. The pertinacity with which the Greek race everywhere seek to place themselves under the rule of the Athenian court, as witness the case of the Ionian islands, is also an element of no slight political strength ; and the courage with which Turkey is at present defied in regard to blockade running, though undoubtedly imprudent, yet excites a certain feeling of admiration which modifies the censure it would otherwise provoke. But there is a weak point in the Greek programme, which, to our apprehension, renders the project for the reconstruction of a Greek empire at Constantinople perfectly Utopian—it is this, that the people of that race now in the world are far too few in number to become the dominant people in an empire ; they can constitute a kingdom of peculiar interest, though of limited political power, and that is all. When they talk of so many millions of Greeks existing in Turkey, they take into their estimate, and quite unauthorisedly, those tribes of the Slavonic race, who, if they agree with the Greeks, properly so called, in their attachment to the eastern church, are by the same characteristic rendered akin to Russia ; to which they have also a close affinity both in race and in language. With three

natural ties to St Petersburg for one to Athens, it is of course to the northern and not to the southern capital that their hearts turn ; and they do so with all the greater force, that, in the moral, as in the material world, there is always a tendency to gravitate towards the largest body. The only hope Greece could have of gaining over those Slavonic populations, would be by ruling her own people on principles so enlightened, that other races could trust themselves under her sceptre ; but it is almost unnecessary to add that the administration at Athens has hitherto been of so miserable a character as to repel rather than to attract. The captain of the Austrian steamer in which the writer sailed stated that, after Greek independence had been achieved, it was very difficult to pass near the new republic, as the sea was infested by Greek pirates, who did not hesitate to make depredations on the commerce of the nations whose fleets had aided them in achieving their deliverance from the Turkish yoke.

We turn next to those Slavonic populations already alluded to, who, if they fight, will fight for their own interest, or for that of their great northern protector, and with no intention of placing themselves under the sceptre of Greece. Some of these inhabit comparatively level provinces, while others find their home amid the fastnesses of the hills. As an example of the latter, take the Montenegrins. In Latham's "Varieties of Man," they figure as a branch of the Servians ; and both remote and recent history confirm the identification. We believe that they may be regarded as constituting that part of the Servian population, who, when Servia was conquered by the Turks, as it was in A.D. 1385, refused to submit to the Mahomedan yoke ; and, to maintain their independence, fled to the wilder parts of the Balkan mountains, which, in the region they inhabit, rise in one place to 8,500, and in another to 9,800 feet above the level of the sea. Their numbers do not exceed 125,000, or 130,000. In the spring of 1846, a tourist entered this little-visited territory, and the observations he made were published in the *Calcutta Review* for January 1849. The Prince of Montenegro professes to be descended from the old Servian kings. His capital is at a place called Cettinich, or Cettigne. He is termed the Vladika, and is not merely the prince of the country, but also the metropolitan bishop or head of the Montenegrin division of the Greek Church. Nevertheless, when the traveller approached the capital of this spiritual ruler, one of the first objects that met his eye was "a small fort, somewhat resembling a Martello tower, and garnished with a row of gory Moslem heads, protruding on poles from

its embrasures!" A month before his arrival, a foray had been made into Bosnia, "which was said to have furnished 1500 head of cattle to those engaged, besides a number of the usual trophies, or *heads* of Moslems for the fort at Cit-tinich." In these circumstances, need we wonder when he tells us, that "at present the Albanian troops who garrison the several Turkish forts, are in the habit of firing at random into the mountains, or aiming in the direction of their villages with their heavy cannon!" The Montenegro was first overrun, it can scarcely be said subjugated, by the Turks, about the year 1640. At the commencement of the eighteenth century, the Vladika, Daniel Petrovich, rose against the Sultan's government, and, bishop as he was, inaugurated his revolt by treachery and murder. Ever since that now somewhat remote period, efforts more or less energetic have been made by the Montenegrins to free themselves entirely from the Turkish yoke, and aid their Servian brethren in reconstructing the old Sclavonic kingdom, which existed in that part of the Danubian valley, and of the Balkan hills, before the entry of the Turks into Europe. Our readers may recollect a very sharp struggle carried on by the Montenegrins in the year 1862; though it did not attract so much notice as it otherwise would have done, from the fact that it occurred while the great American war was fiercely in progress. It terminated somewhat unfavourably for the mountaineers, who were compelled to acknowledge the sovereignty of the Porte. But it cannot be said to have ended triumphantly for Turkey, since before it closed it had sent such a sympathetic thrill throughout Servia, and specially through Belgrade, its capital, as to provoke the commandant of the celebrated fortress there to perpetrate the wicked and most impolitic enormity of bombarding the town. In consequence of this outrage, the Servians threatened war, and could not be pacified by the diplomatists till they had obtained a guarantee that Belgrade, and the other fortresses hitherto garrisoned by Turks, should be given over to the native troops. Thus, if we except the payment of a small tribute, Servia has virtually achieved its independence of the Porte. The population of the province is estimated at 1,098,281, nearly all Sclavonians of the Greek Church.

It is unnecessary to repeat the story about "the principalities," pre-eminently so called, Moldavia and Wallachia, the invasion of which by Russia in 1853 brought on first the Turco-Russian, and eventually the Crimean war. They hang now to Turkey by a single thread; and, whether separate from each other, or as now united under one government, are not likely to be troubled more with Mahomedan

oppression. The population of Moldavia is estimated at 1,600,000, that of Wallachia at 2,400,920.

Bounding Serbia on the west, and like it a Danubian province, lies Bosnia, with a population of 1,500,000, of a very mixed character, perhaps 800,000 being Mahomedans; 150,000 Romanists; and 550,000 of the Greek Church. It is not so favourably situated for revolt against Turkey as the principalities already mentioned; though its inhabitants in the main belong to the Slavonic race.

The wild character of the coast is the next Turkish province to be mentioned, Albania, particularly impressed us as we sailed past it in the Austrian vessel. Snow was distinctly discernible on one of the South Albanian mountains, almost precisely opposite to the harbour of Corfu. Some miles further north, a yet more remarkable phenomenon presented itself. So regular and so steep was the incline from the mountain summits to the sea, that, at one place, exactly as if a map, pasted on a stiff card, had been slanted against a wall, did we see at the same glance the dry bed of a river, with all its tributaries, from the spot where each rose to where it terminated. In the immediate vicinity is that savage promontory which was so much dreaded by Greek and Roman mariners, and to which Horace alludes in the 3d Ode of his First Book :

“ Quem mortis timuit gradum,
Qui siccis oculis monstra natantia,
Qui vidit mare turbidum, et
Infames scopulos Acroceraunia ? ”

The nearest approach to the aspect of the Albanian coast we have seen in Britain was on the western shore of Scotland, a little south of the entrance to the Caledonian Canal. It was from those wild hills now spoken of that Pyrrhus drew those hardy troops with which he aided Tarentum, and for a certain period managed there and elsewhere to make respectable resistance to the Roman arms. So tenaciously have its inhabitants held their place, that the language spoken at present is believed to be fundamentally akin to that used in the same locality at the very dawn of history. Here, in the middle of the fifteenth century, George Castriot, otherwise termed Scanderbeg, resisted the whole power of the Crescent, and did not, while he lived, allow his country to fall under its tyrant sway. Here, at the beginning of the present one, the bold yet ruffianly Ali Pasha reared his power, till ultimately he believed he might carry out his revenges in the very midst of Constantinople itself. From this province, too, come those warlike adventurers, who, under the name of Arnauts, given by the Turks to the inhabitants

42 *The Eastern Question—Its Religious Bearings.*

of Albania, act as mercenaries in many parts of the East. Though the nominal Mahomedanism of a large number of the Albanians may prevent the aspirations of the people of that province taking the same direction as that of their more northern neighbours, yet their independent, not to say their turbulent, character, prevent their being of so much service to Turkey, as they otherwise would be. Politically speaking, Albania, like the Danubian principalities, bounding it on the north, hangs to Turkey by a frail thread.

Bulgaria, with a population of 3,000,000, mostly speaking the Servian language, and professing the Greek faith, must sooner or later follow on the same track as the people of the Danubian principalities, though it is not certain that they are very closely akin to them in race—some ethnologists, as for instance Latham, being of opinion that the mass of the Bulgarians are descended from the barbarous tribe of that name, which gave so much trouble to the Byzantine empire, till Christianised in the ninth century, and that those invaders were not really Slavonic, but were of the Turkish race.

Rumilia, from its proximity to Constantinople, is not at all favourably situated for shaking off the Turkish yoke. Thessaly, from its southern boundary line, being conterminous with the northern frontier of Greece, receives a series of galvanic shocks from its independent neighbour; and, towards the close of last year, it, with the adjacent ports of Epirus (Southern Albania), was threatened by the Porte with a great expedition by sea and by land. As the time when these hostile proceedings were to commence was fixed for the spring of the present year, and nothing of importance then took place, the thunder-cloud in that quarter has evidently blown over for the present. The provinces, now hastily passed in review, make up the whole of Turkey in Europe, with the exception of the islands, and it is manifest that there are not more than two, or at the most three, provinces, on which the Moslem hold is even of moderate strength.

Turning next to the islands, the only one properly belonging to Europe that is of importance enough to demand formal notice is Candia. The events there in progress have excited so widespread an interest, that it is unnecessary to enter into any detail regarding them. All that is needful to do is to point out the close analogy they present to others with which the Turkish government should now be well acquainted, for it has had experience of them frequently. In Candia, as in other parts of European Turkey, the historic phenomenon is presented of a Christian people long in subjection,

and making complaint of being grievously oppressed, rising in arms against the dominant Turkish, or at least Mahomedan race. When public attention is turned to the case, then all become aware that the subject Christians are much more numerous than the Mahomedans, who yet monopolise nearly all places of trust and of dignity. In Candia, for example, in 1863, the Mahomedans were estimated at 106,855, and the Christians at 217,145, the former as well as the latter using the Greek language. An inquiry into grievances is promised, but produces no effect, as it comes too late. So the dispute has to be decided by arms. War has not long gone on, when an official statement comes from Constantinople, that the rebellion is over ; a few weeks after which we hear that it is still in progress. Next a new intimation is received that it has been suppressed, which, however, does not prevent its making way as vigorously as before. Simultaneously with these telegrams from the supreme government come others from the insurgents, always stating that the Turks have been defeated with great loss ; but these victories tread so quickly on the heels of each other, that if they actually occurred, and were of the importance pretended, the patriots would soon achieve their independence, and would not require, what they so urgently seek, foreign aid. By and by we hear that the insurgents are being overwhelmed by numbers ; and at last a credible telegram arrives, to the effect that the rebellion is at an end. But things are not restored to their former condition. The Powers of Europe insist that certain reforms shall be carried out, and that the Mahomedan yoke shall to a certain extent be rendered less galling than before.

Thus the process goes on, nor do we think it is yet nearly at an end. What reason, for instance, have we for believing that Cyprus will not follow in the footsteps of Crete ? The disproportion between the numbers of the Christians is as great ; and there are abundance of mountains in the one as in the other case to render a protracted struggle easy. If future events preserve any analogy with those that are past, the entire Christian races of European Turkey, and of the leading islands European and Asiatic that have bowed before the Crescent, will gradually free themselves from the Moslem fetters. They are doing it before our eyes, and the process is tolerably rapid. When the French Revolution of 1789 was drawing to a close, and the old political landscape of Europe, if such a phrase may be employed, was again becoming visible, men compared it to the subsidence of a deluge, and noted how the old institutions which had been for a season overwhelmed one by one reappeared above the

flood. In similar manner is the Mahomedan deluge abating. First the hills of Greece, and now again the tall fortress of Belgrade, have appeared above the waters. We had thought of the metaphor here employed before remembering, that assuming the correctness of the interpretation given by most Protestant commentators of Rev. xvi. 12, it is the Scriptural one, a remarkable coincidence.

But in estimating the future of European Turkey, it must be remembered that the territory just named is politically united with other provinces in circumstances very different from itself. In Asiatic Turkey the Mahomedans vastly outnumber the subject Christians, and can in a manner hold them as hostages for the good behaviour of their co-religionists in Europe. And the more any one has come in contact with the Mahomedans, the more he feels anxious for the Christians of Asiatic Turkey in the view of possible events. Admitting the enlightenment of a small party in Constantinople who have gained a certain notion of western civilisation, we have no doubt that all the other Moslems of Turkey are very much like their co-religionists everywhere else; in other words, indolent at most times, but yet capable of being aroused to the most dreadful fanaticism. Even their priests or moulavies are in liberality but a shade in advance of the uneducated part of their followers, and are more likely to counsel sanguinary measures against Christians, than to hold back those whose natural proclivities are to shedding Christian blood. As this last statement is one which will run counter to the convictions of many, we solicit their indulgence, while we present the details of a formal inquiry made a few years ago on the subject. The scene of the investigation was India; and it was made in connection with the promulgation by the Sultan of the celebrated firman and Hatti-Sherif in the early part of 1856. The wonderfully-enlightened character of that reforming edict, for which it is believed that the Christian world is really indebted to Lord Stratford de Redcliffe, then Her Majesty's representative at the Porte, will stand forth anew before the minds of our readers, if we recall to their minds a few of its more important paragraphs, as for instance the following :—

“ All the privileges and spiritual immunities granted by my ancestors *ab antiquo*, and at subsequent dates, to all Christian communities or non-Mussulman persuasions established in my empire under my protection, shall be confirmed and maintained.”

“ In the towns, small boroughs, and villages, where different sects are mingled together, each community, inhabiting a distinct quarter, shall, by conforming to the above-mentioned ordinances, have equal

power to repair and improve its churches, its hospitals, its schools, and its cemeteries."

"My Sublime Porte will take energetic measures to insure to each sect, whatever be the number of its adherents, entire freedom in the exercise of its religion."

"Every distinction or designation tending to make any class whatever of the subjects of my empire inferior to another class, on account of their religion, language, or race, shall be for ever effaced from the Administrative Protocol. The laws shall be put in force against the use of any injurious or offensive term, either among private individuals, or on the part of the authorities."

"As all forms of religion are and shall be freely professed in my empire, no subject shall be hindered in the exercise of the religion that he professes, nor shall be in any way annoyed on this account. None shall be compelled to change their religion."

"The nomination and choice of all functionaries and other *employés* of my empire being wholly dependent upon my sovereign will, all the subjects of my empire, without distinction of nationality, shall be admissible to public employments, and qualified to fill them according to their capacity and merit, and conformably with rules to be generally applied."

"All the subjects of my empire, without distinction, shall be received into the civil and military schools of the government, if they otherwise satisfy the conditions as to age and examination which are specified in the organic regulations of the said schools. Moreover, every community is authorised to establish public schools of science, art, and industry."

"All commercial, correctional, and criminal suits between Mussulmans and Christians, or other non-Mussulman subjects, or between Christians or other non-Mussulmans of different sects, shall be referred to mixed tribunals. The proceedings of these tribunals shall be public; the parties shall be confronted, and shall produce their witnesses, whose testimony shall be received, without distinction, upon an oath taken according to the religious law of each sect."

"The equality of taxes entailing equality of burdens, as equality of duties entails that of rights, Christian subjects, and those of other non-Mussulman sects, as it has been already decided, shall, as well as Mussulman, be subject to the obligations of the law of recruitment. The principle of obtaining substitutes, or of purchasing exemption, shall be admitted. A complete law shall be published, with as little delay as possible, respecting the admission into our service in the army of Christian and other non-Mussulman subjects."

"As the laws regulating the purchase, sale, and disposal of real property are common to all the subjects of my empire, it shall be lawful for foreigners to possess landed property in my dominions, conforming themselves to the laws and police regulations, and bearing the same charges as the native inhabitants, and after arrangements have been come to with foreign powers."

"The heads of each community and a delegate, designated by my Sublime Porte, shall be summoned to take part in the deliberations

46 *The Eastern Question—Its Religious Bearings.*

of the Supreme Council of Justice on all occasions, which might interest the generality of the subjects of my empire. They shall be summoned specially for this purpose by my Grand Vizier. The delegates shall hold office for one year; they shall be sworn on entering upon their duties. All the members of the council, at the ordinary and extraordinary meetings, shall freely give their opinions and their votes, and no one shall ever annoy them on this account."

"Such being my wishes and my commands, you who are my Grand Vizier will, according to custom, cause this imperial firman to be published in my capital, and in all parts of my empire; and you will watch attentively and take all the necessary measures, that all the orders which it contains be henceforth carried out with the most rigorous punctuality."

This splendid state paper was worthy of being called the Magna Charta of the Christians in Turkey; but unhappily there was an essential element wanting to make the parallel between it and its British prototype complete. The Magna Charta granted at Runnymede was extorted by stout barons who took care that the concessions it embodied should really be carried out. The Turkish enactment, on the contrary, was obtained, not through means of the Christian races under the sway of the Sultan, but by the moral pressure of Turkey's all-potent allies, the western powers. Very true are the words of the poet—

"Who would be free, himself must strike the blow;"

and this the Christians under the sceptre of the Moslems had not done, when the Hatti-Sherif was promulgated. Hence there was a danger that it might prove a dead letter; or, if carried into effect, might stir up Mussulman insurrections against the supreme authority. In these circumstances it occurred to Sir Culling Eardley that it would greatly strengthen the hands of the Sultan, and facilitate his advance in the new and enlightened course on which he had entered, if an address approving of liberty of conscience could be obtained from the Mahomedan moulavies (priests or theologians) in India; and such support would be all the more valuable that the Sultan, while communicating the Hatti-Sherif to his allies, had firmly refused to permit their binding him to it by treaty. The wonderful thing was, that in a place so enlightened as the Committee Room of the Evangelical Alliance, it should be supposed that the Mahomedan clergy, or even the Mahomedan laity of India, could be induced to utter a word in favour of religious liberty. Yet more remarkable was it that this opinion was founded on representation made by "old Indians," who had actually come in contact with Mahomedans in the east. The reason probably was this: the natives of our eastern possessions

are on their good behaviour, when they present themselves before the civil and military officers of government, and in general disguise their real sentiments, which however they have little hesitation in giving forth, when they have to do with only missionaries or others destitute of political authority. But account for it as we may, certain it is that the idea was entertained that the Indian moulavies might be induced to strengthen the hands of the Sultan, and aid him in his reforming courses, by a declaration in favour of religious liberty. So a message was despatched by Sir Culling to the Rev. Dr Duff. The answer not being such as was anticipated, was, if we mistake not, suppressed at the time in Britain, lest its purport should reach Turkey, and strengthen the hands, not of the enlightened party in Constantinople, but of their foes. An extract from an editorial article on the subject in the "*Friend of India*" for October 16. 1856, will give some idea how matters really stood:—

"He [Sir Culling Eardley] hardly appears to have doubted for a moment that the reply to his reference would be favourable. He seems to have expected that it would convey 'such a declaration of Mahomedan feeling as would possess irresistible weight with the Mahomedan mind of the Turkish empire.' "

Though Dr Duff was not for a moment under any illusion as to what the reply was likely to be, yet in all good faith he first consulted the Missionary Conference of Calcutta, and then, says the *Friend*, "drew up a set of queries, copies of which were referred to all persons in Bengal and Upper India, lay and missionary, known to be at once interested in missions, and conversant with Mahomedanism. They were also translated, and submitted to the most learned Moulavies (Mahomedan theologians) in Calcutta. The questions are in substance as follows":—

"1st, Did the law of the Mahomedan emperors inculcate the death penalty for apostacy, and was the penalty ever enforced? Was any distinction made between born Mahomedans and converts to Islam, who afterwards became renegades?"

"2d, Do the Indian Mahomedans feel aggrieved in that the British Government does not permit them to enforce the death-penalty?"

"3d, Are Indian Mahomedans aware of the Sultan's Hatti-Sherif's abolishing the death-penalty, and do they approve of it?"

In their replies to these questions, the referees, both missionaries and Moulavies, shew almost absolute unanimity. The substance of their replies may be presented thus:—

"1st, Death for apostasy has always been the law of the Mahomedan States of India. For the born Mussulman, if a male, repent-

48 *The Eastern Question—Its Religious Bearings.*

ance is of no avail. But for the convert to Islam, who afterwards falls away and finally repents, there is mercy. There is also mercy for penitent female apostates. There is no authentic evidence that the sentence of death was ever inflicted. A certain amount of toleration was the necessary policy of the Mussulman emperors, who could not otherwise have reconciled the Hindoos to their rule. But all good Mussulmans believe that such toleration was sinful, and is not to be considered as a precedent. The emperors placed the law of death for apostacy in abeyance, and it is unfortunately in abeyance still, but it is the law of Islam nevertheless.

“ 2d, The Indian Mahomedans *do* consider it a grievance that they are restrained by the English Government from enforcing the law. This naturally follows from the answers to the former question.

“ 3d, Few Indian Mussulmans have heard of the Hatti-Sherif; few of those who have heard of it believe in it, and those who do, say that the Sultan has become a Kafir [an infidel].”

In India, the Mahomedans doggedly set themselves against western civilisation. Very few of their children are permitted to attend schools taught by Europeans. There are not many at mission schools; and even the exclusion of religious teaching cannot charm more than a limited number of them into the seminaries of the Government. Open a school anywhere in India, and the heathen Hindoos will enter it, while the Mahomedans, as a whole, hold aloof; and during the Crimean war we observed the significant intimation, that where the Sultan opened schools, they were thronged by Greek boys, while his own co-religionists shewed no disposition to become scholars. The result of this fatal policy is seen when the Mussulmans, who ought to have been pupils in boyhood, but have not been so, grow up to man's estate. There are very few lucrative situations which persons so deficient in education can fill: hence the Mussulmans, whom we found rulers of a great portion of India, are continually permitting the Hindoos, whom once they dominated over, to snatch from them all the prizes of life, while they themselves are yearly sinking further down and down in station, and from being the aristocracy of native Indian society, are on the way to becoming its lapsed masses.

There met some months ago, in England, three ministers, who had all had experience of the Mahomedan character, two in the Turkish empire, the third in India. All had come to the same conclusion with regard to the probable future of the Turkish empire. It was that by revolts like that of Candia, in European Turkey, the Christians on this side the Bosphorus would gradually free themselves to a large extent from Mahomedan domination; but that, at a certain point, the believers in the Koran would become greatly ex-

cited by seeing their power falling. On becoming roused, the Mahomedans of Asia Minor, and other parts of Asiatic Turkey, would then in all probability attempt to perpetrate a massacre of the Christians there, on a scale of magnitude such as has not been witnessed in modern times.

If such a frightful contingency be even possible, the Christian powers would do well to have their minds made up beforehand as to how they should act in the circumstances, for very little time for deliberation will be afforded if the crisis come. There is one power whose mind is already made up—we mean Russia; for in a dispatch to our own and other governments, she has declared that in certain circumstances she will interfere on behalf of the Christians of Turkey, “though torrents of blood should flow.” But who could blame her, if such a crisis as that we dread should arise? We could not stand forth as apologists for massacre, especially if the victims bore the Christian name. What then should be done? We think the answer is not involved in much difficulty. As in all other cases, the path of duty is the path of safety. Let the Christian powers be prepared to act in common on the side of humanity, and on the first occasion on which massacre of Christians is attempted by Mahomedans anywhere in the world, let the murderers be brought to justice, and let it be distinctly made known everywhere that Mahomedan massacres of Christians, simply for bearing that honoured name, in addition to the guilt of such crimes, are an insult to every follower of Jesus in the world; and whatever labour, expenditure of money, or of life, be necessary to bring the perpetrators of such enormities to justice, the Christian Powers pledge their honour that it shall be done. But after all precautions have been taken, the mind will still remain anxious, and can regain composure in no other way than by reflecting that the Lord God omnipotent reigneth; and that the Divine Redeemer feels the deepest interest in all his followers on earth, however humble may be their lot; as was evinced when, on the road to Damascus, he struck down one, then a haughty oppressor of the Church, and, in explanation, said to him reproachfully, “Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou Me?”

R. H.

Editorial Note.—The preceding article should have appeared in our October number, but it will be found not less applicable to the present time.

ART. III.—*A Mahomedan Commentary on the Bible.*

(Second Notice.)

The Mahomedan Commentary on the Holy Bible. By SAYAD AHMAD. Part First. Ghazipore : Printed and published by the Author at his private press. 1862.

The Mahomedan Commentary on the Holy Bible. By SAYAD AHMAD. Part Second. Allyghur : Printed and published by the Author at his private press. 1865.

IN passing from a consideration of Sayad Ahmad's views with regard to the authenticity and authority of the Bible, to a consideration of his attempts to reconcile the Mahomedan faith with it, we are met by the difficulty that he has as yet attempted the criticism of only the first eleven chapters of the book of Genesis. As he does not take up any topic not suggested by them, several important doctrines are omitted, and we cannot tell how he may succeed in making them accord with the Scriptures. A more important difficulty is the manner in which he treats the doctrines which he does take up. He does not seek so much to reconcile the Mahomedan religion with the Bible, as the Bible with the Mahomedan religion. He continually brings in the Mahomedan doctrine as the rule of interpretation. "According to the belief of us Mahomedans," is the formula with which he gives the authoritative meaning of any passage. He supports it by analogous passages quoted from other parts of the Bible, and dismisses all that are opposed to his view with the assurance that they will be treated of in their proper place. As the Christian faith is founded on a general view of the entire Scriptures, and as the first chapters must be interpreted in the light of what follows, this is not a fair way of going to work, and it is one which in the end must prove fatal to Sayad Ahmad's own positions. He has in fact forgotten in a great degree the maxim which he himself has laid down—to study the Scriptures as a whole. We by no means think, however, that he has succeeded even on these tactics. On the contrary, the most careful perusal of the commentary, with full anxiety to allow due weight to all he says, must shew that on all points where Mahomedanism differs from Christianity, he has entirely failed to reconcile the former with the Bible.

It will facilitate the consideration of the subject if, instead of following the order of chapters, we take up successive topics and doctrines. There are many points on which Mahomedanism and Christianity are agreed, and on these Sayad Ahmad has allowed himself much greater latitude than on the distinctive

principles of his creed. We may begin with some of them, and proceed afterwards to those in which the two religions are more opposed.

One of the first questions that meets us, on opening the second volume of the Commentary, is the authority of the Pentateuch in its present form. He gives it as the Mahomedan opinion, that we have it in the form in which Ezra rewrote it :—

“Imam Fakhr-ud-din Razi relates in his commentary, on the authority of Ibna Abbas, that the Jews had lost the Pentateuch, and were behaving in a way opposed to its original commands. Thereupon God made them forget the law and took it out of their hearts ; but Ezra humbled himself and abased his heart before God. Then God caused him to remember the law, and by means thereof he gave instructions to the children of Israel. When they examined it, they found it correct, on which they began to say, He is not man, but the Son of God. . . . From these quotations this fact is established, that the existing Pentateuch is the work of Ezra, and, according to the creed of us Mussulmans, the same faith and reverence are to be shewn to that law which, under divine inspiration, Ezra wrote, as were due to that which Moses himself wrote, because Moses and Ezra were both prophets, and we Mussulmans do not allow any difference between any prophets.”—(Pp. 14, 15.)

Hence he has no difficulty in answering objections raised from the use of the third person, and references to dates and events subsequent to Moses.

“In refuting these objections, those have certainly met with difficulties who are convinced that the Pentateuch we have now in our hands is a copy of the manuscript which was written by Moses himself. But as we Mahomedans believe that the present Pentateuch was written by Ezra, we have no difficulty whatever : for if Ezra did write this book, then, as a matter of course, Moses would be spoken of in the third person, and the events that had happened up to his time would be spoken of just as we find them.”—(P. 40.)

The above quoted extract from Fakhr-ud-din Razi is interesting to European critics, as shewing what eastern tradition says on the subject of the revisal of the Old Testament by Ezra. Sayad Ahmad may have quoted it to predispose his co-religionists to accept the Pentateuch, but does he not see that, with those who cannot fully accept his dogmas, he is destroying all its title to credit ? To persons who deny inspiration, the Pentateuch, if allowed to be written by Moses and preserved by successive manuscripts—even though interpolations may have been inserted—would appear entitled to some credit as a historical work, but if we have it from the source he has indicated, it would be of no authority whatever. Does he not see the palpable contradictions and absurdities of the

story he has quoted and homologated? According to it, God had caused the Jews to forget the Pentateuch altogether. Yet when Ezra gave it to them again, they compared it with the original and found it correct. They pronounced judgment on what they had totally forgotten. If this be true, God must have revealed it to them as well as to Ezra; they too must have been inspired. In giving weight to such stories, Sayad Ahmad can only bring ridicule on his commentary and his religion.

In passing from the introduction to the text itself, the first topic we may take up as common to Christianity and Mahomedanism, is the reconciliation of Scripture and science. Sayad Ahmad, in attempting this, generally adopts those interpretations which accord with the present state of science, and rejects those which have been adopted to reconcile the Bible with science in its less advanced state. He does so in a spirit of liberty and reverence, which is a reproof to many Christian controversialists.

“I can never assent to the idea that sacred books—all the Scriptures, including even the holy Koran—are not to be minutely and critically examined. Dare any one say that reason, that most noble of God’s gifts, has been given to us to remain unemployed? Can we on whom this power has been bestowed, be true Christians or Mahomedans, unless we examine our holy Scriptures with thoughtful, careful criticism, and on them found an unfeigned faith? If we are ourselves able by thought and examination to establish our own faith, will it suffice to answer before God that we are Christians or Mahomedans just because our fathers were Christians or Mahomedans. On the contrary, I earnestly desire that these sacred writings be examined with fairness and with respectful, but not impertinent, freedom. . . . I am not sorry to find that Bishop Colenso should point out historical inaccuracies in the holy Scripture if he really can, but I do regret that he should have so completely forgotten this respectful freedom. I speak not indeed in accordance with the generality of Christians, but in perfect accordance with those principles which I have laid down with regard to the holy Scriptures, which are, I believe, perfectly agreeable to the Mahomedan religion, and to which I find that many Christians also are ready to assent, that even if any one should point out inaccuracies in the historical parts of the holy Scriptures (if there be any such), he cannot prove them to be untrustworthy until such errors in the revelation itself be established,* as to make belief in it impossible. This being the case, even if Bishop Colenso should have pointed out some errors in the history, what need I care about answering him? But I say further, that if, without

* The Mahomedans consider only the direct sayings of the prophets to be revelations, and the rest to be mere narratives to explain the circumstances in which they were given. See *British and Foreign Evangelical Review* for July pp 562, 568.

making an idol of the Bible, we examine it with respect and honesty of purpose, those very historical mistakes, as Colenso calls them, would turn out not to be mistakes at all, but the mistake had been ours in giving them a false meaning which we held as true. This then is what we must fearlessly and honestly do—we must disabuse ourselves of our mistaken notions without caring for the fact that our fathers held them, and in accordance with the advancement of the age and the conquests of science, examine the sacred volume with all reverence and candour. For this reason my readers will find that in this commentary I have not been at all fettered by those opinions which Jewish, Christian, and Mahomedan writers have without inquiry, and solely on the strength of the belief of their forefathers, maintained. I have been fettered only by the holy Scriptures, by the truth, and by the true God, who has sent his prophets and revealed his will to enable us to walk by the truth alone.”—(Pp. 340, 341.)

On scientific questions accordingly Sayad Ahmad expresses himself generally with considerable independence, though we may not be inclined to follow his exegesis or accept his conclusions. In explaining the six days of creation he says:—

“For the length of the first three days we have no data, as the sun did not exist. The light and darkness must have been produced directly by God, through means which we cannot now comprehend, and may have continued twelve hours each, or many ages.” But from the fourth day, “The work that he had formerly done by his almighty power he had now, in his perfect wisdom, made conformable to the laws of nature. Therefore, the day and night spoken of in this verse must have been produced by this law. That is to say, by the motion of the earth, which had now been completed, the day went, and the night followed. These must have been the ordinary night and day of twelve hours each.”—(P. 80.)

The account of the creation, beginning with the fifth verse of the second chapter, however, he considers to be quite distinct, in point of time, from that spoken of in the first chapter; and the Adam of the second account, to be quite distinct from the former man.

“To the former Adam liberty was given to eat of the fruits of all herbs and trees, but our father Adam had not liberty to eat of the fruits of all the trees. The first man was created male and female; the second Adam was created single, and placed in the garden of Eden, and then his wife, Eve, was created from his rib. The former Adam had liberty to eat of the vegetables alone, but not animal food, while we see that the second man had liberty to eat of animals also (Gen. vii. 2, 3). The birds and beasts of the former creation ate only the leaves of trees, while those of our time do not eat leaves alone.”—(P. 90.)

In this way, by shewing that, according to the strict inter-

pretation of Scripture, there may have been many series of creations, not of animals only, but of men, before that of our parent Adam, Sayad Ahmad thinks that he has answered the geologists in their objections to the credibility of the Scripture narrative. But his explanation does not meet the facts of geology. He allows only twenty-four hours between the appearance of fishes and animals on the earth, while geology points to many ages. He fails here, simply because he does not preserve a consistent mode of interpretation. Why should he interpret the words *day*, *night*, and *morning*, differently in the latter half of the chapter from what he does in the former? May not the same causes have operated during the last three days as during the first three days, obscuring and revealing the light of the sun. He says that the revolution of the earth produces day and night, but, taking him on his own ground, it does so only on one part of its surface at a time. It is always day on some parts of the earth, and if this is the account of a process of creation over the whole globe, its revolution will not account for the changes of day and night thus referred to. He has here failed to give a consistent interpretation, or to grasp completely the facts with which he has to deal. In speaking of the two Adams likewise, it would have given him much more power to have dwelt generally on the fact of a new narrative beginning in the second chapter, for the differences which he points out are mere details, and both accounts might quite consistently apply to the same event.

We now leave scientific questions, and come to those more especially dogmatic, in which issue is more distinctly joined with Christianity. Most of those that are brought before us in this volume circle round the story of the fall. On the view that may be taken of it depend very greatly the consequent doctrines that may be taught in any system of religion, and we shall find in Sayad Ahmad's explanation of it the basis of the Mahomedan faith. The first thesis which he maintains, however, is one even more opposed to it than to the Christian faith. It is that Satan or the Devil has no personal existence,—that he is only an allegory.

“If we Mahomedans carefully consider our own sacred books, we shall find that Satan has no existence apart from man. I do not deny that, just as we see that there are many classes of creatures beneath us, so we have no ground for denying that there may be several classes of created beings superior to us. Nay, we even find proofs of their existence in the Bible, and the holy books of our own religion, but Satan is nowhere included in these beings. The real fact is, that God has, in his perfect wisdom, put in man's nature and constitution principles of good and evil, one being called his spiritual nature and the other his sensuous nature. Of these, the sensuous nature, which

tempts man to sin and wickedness, was originally known as Satan.”
—(Pp. 146, 147.)

It will be seen that this is the view of many European Rationalists, and it is from their writings, we believe, that Sayad Ahmad has adopted it, notwithstanding what he says about the books of his religion. No passage of his commentary excited greater opposition among his co-religionists in India than this. It is true, he was opposed to them on the question of the integrity of the Scriptures, and we have seen reason to believe that, in opposition to them, he has triumphantly shewn that his views are in accordance with the true Mahomedan doctrine. But the quotations by which he supports his views in the present instance are not so convincing. He gives an immense number of them, but the following may serve as a specimen, neither better nor worse than the most:—

“In that book (the Mishkat) a Hadis is quoted that Usman, son of Abi Alas, relates that he represented to the prophet of God that Satan interfered between him and his reading and prayer, and distracted his attention. The prophet of God answered—That is Satan whom they call Khinzib, and whenever thou recognisest him, ask protection from God against his evil, and spit to the left three times (this is a deed designed to diminish the temptation). The writer adds that he did so, and God drove him from him. Now, observe the condition referred to in this Hadis. Nothing can interfere between a man and his prayers but his own thoughts, which clearly proves that they are the tempter called Satan.”—(P. 148.)

The other quotations are all similar to this. It will be observed that the argument is not direct, but inferential, and is founded on a pure begging of the question, that nothing can interfere between a man and his prayers but his own thoughts. Sayad Ahmad also quotes some passages from the New Testament in support of his theory. The following is one:—John xiii. 27, “‘And after the sop Satan entered into him.’ Can you imagine that Satan rushed like air into Judas Iscariot’s belly, or into his whole nature?” We are not required to imagine this, but only that the evil spirit acted on his spirit. How would our author’s own theory suit? Can we imagine that the animal powers were not in Judas Iscariot before as well as after taking the sop? If the English version of the commentary be from Sayad Ahmad himself, it supplies us with a clue to his difficulty, as well as to that of many others. In the former of these two quotations, the sentence occurs, “There was evidently nothing outwardly to disturb him, or estrange his mind from its holy occupation.” Satan does not act outwardly but inwardly, as a spirit on a spirit. Sayad Ahmad

evidently confounds a personal Satan with a corporeal Satan. This latter is the view prevalent among Mahomedans. He is spoken of sometimes as being made of fire, and in almost all cases, as having some sort of material though very subtle body. A recoil from this gross idea has probably led Sayad Ahmad to go to the opposite extreme, and deny his personal existence altogether. In feeling sure of our readiness to reject the former idea, he has never stopped to examine, and does not seem even to have comprehended the latter idea. He allows that there are passages both in the Bible and the Koran which militate against his theory, but, *more suo*, he defers the examination of them till they occur in their own places.

Having taken this view of the nature of Satan, he could not very well adopt a literal view of the story of the fall, and accordingly we find that he treats it altogether as an allegory. He explains the meaning of the tree of life, and the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thus :—

“ God breathed into man’s body a spirit which was certainly much nobler than that of all the other animals. The great object of giving such a spirit was, that in all those things which pertain to the Spirit, man should exceed the other animals. Those things were only two—the first, that eternal existence of which God spake when he said, ‘ I AM ;’ and the second, the knowledge of good and evil. The greatness of these two things, God revealed to Adam, and he did so by the parable of the tree of life, and of the knowledge of good and evil, not meaning that these trees were like other trees in the garden of Eden.” —(P. 125.)

In the following passage, Sayad Ahmad gives the reason why God forbade him to eat of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil :—

“ God prohibited Adam from eating of this tree only for his own welfare and advantage, not because the doing so was a transgression of any law. For it is said further on, If thou shalt eat of it, thou shalt die a kind of death, which was to be the fruit of disobeying God’s advice. If the eating of it had been the breaking of any law, a much severer punishment would have been inflicted.” —(P. 126.)

These two passages are so full of contradictions, that it is difficult to find where to begin to unravel them. We learn first, that one end for which God created man’s spirit was that he might gain a knowledge of good and evil, but nevertheless he warned him not to try to gain that end of his being. The other end for which he was created, was to attain to an eternal existence, but as we are told expressly that Adam was expelled from the garden of Eden before he had tasted of the tree of life, we must conclude that he has not yet attained to this end

of his being. The gaining of the first end, we further learn, could not be attained without undergoing punishment for it; the transgression of a divine injunction is not a sin, and death is not a severe punishment.

Consistently with this, he explains the story of the temptation to be merely a debate between Eve and the devilishness within her. The eating of the fruit he allegorises thus:—

“The eating of the fruit of the tree is simply the acceptance of that condition (of being able to distinguish between good and evil). Man, in his ignorance and stupidity, desired that the faculty of knowing good and evil should be imparted to him—was willing to raise this heavy burden, which neither earth nor heaven could bear, and to take it on his own head. As is said in the holy Koran, we proposed the trust to the heavens, and the earth, and the mountains, and no one would consent to undertake it, but were afraid of the same, but man undertook it.”—(P. 117.)

He thus concludes the discussion:—

“The sum of all this passage briefly is—when God created man and gave him life, he was like other animals, wholly void of discernment—he had not the power of knowing good and evil. Only in so far as God shewed him did he know anything. For this reason he was without vexation, he was wholly guiltless, and he had no fear of any kind of death, for what he did at that time, he did not with his own understanding. God revealed to him the power of knowing good and evil, and warned him not to take it, for, if he did, he would die a certain kind of death, namely, he would fall into this severe calamity that he would be responsible for his own deeds, would have himself to distinguish between every action as right or wrong, and, as he would receive the reward of good deeds, would receive also the punishment of evil deeds. Man did not heed this warning of God, and acquired a knowledge of good and evil, by reason of which we are now responsible for our actions, are involved in evil deeds, and receive the reward of our good deeds. Thus it may be said that this is the prime cause of the coming of evil to man.”—(P. 158.)

The allegorical interpretation in the above extracts is not, so far as we know, allowed by Mahomedans generally, but the main principles advocated are, we believe, fundamental ones in their faith. The first is, that man was created sinful, that is with sinful propensities, by God. This is a doctrine plainly stated in the Koran, and often brought forward and dwelt upon by Mahomedan writers. The second is, that it is knowledge which has elevated him in the scale of being, and distinguished him from all other creatures; that the eating of the forbidden fruit (whether that be a fact or an allegory) has given him knowledge and consequent responsibility. They have a tradition that, at the creation of man, God commanded the angels to worship him, and when they remonstrated

asking why he thus elevated one who would not obey him, he replied, that he would shew them how much superior man was to them. He then asked them the names of the animals he had created, but none of them could tell. Thereupon God called Adam, to whom he had previously revealed the names, and bade him tell them, which he did; and the angels, convinced of his superiority, worshipped him, with the exception of Satan. The principal idea contained in this myth is the superiority which knowledge confers,—a superiority much greater than moral goodness. Hence it is that they look on the eating of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil as conferring a higher status on man, and making him a responsible being.

This brings us now to the fundamental difference between Mahomedan and Christian doctrine. The Mahomedan doctrine teaches that God created man sinful but ignorant, and therefore not responsible; that partaking of the fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil (whether this be accepted literally or figuratively) introduced knowledge, and consequent responsibility,—a liability to punishment, but also a capability of reward. The Christian doctrine is, that man was created holy, intelligent, and responsible, with power to stand, and free to fall; that eating of the forbidden fruit made him sinful, gave him a practical knowledge of the distinction between good and evil, and made him liable to punishment. The Mahomedan doctrine is certainly more conformable with the *ourang-outang* theory than the Christian; but which is more conformable with the word of God? Without dwelling on multitudes of other passages which will occur to the reader, let us confine our attention to that under comment. It is said that man was created in the image of God. Is God himself sinful, or is he holy? If the Mahomedan doctrine be true, he must be sinful, for man was created in his image, and he was created sinful. Is God intelligent and wise, or is he ignorant? If the Mahomedan doctrine be true, he must be ignorant, for man was created in his image, and he was created ignorant. As to responsibility, the very fact that God shewed him that his act would be followed by punishment, shews that he must have been responsible. As to the change which the fall introduced, we see that it produced shame and fear, much more like the result of sin than of knowledge. Which is the more conformable with reason? The Mahomedan doctrine teaches that the fall introduced an entirely new element into man's nature,—an element which, while it ennobled him, was withheld by his Maker, and the seeking of which was attended by punishment. The Christian doctrine teaches that the fall introduced only a new exercise of powers already there, in

a way that was followed by a necessary consequence. Man, in perfect freedom, chose to disobey God, to separate himself from him, and this separation is the very essence of that spiritual death which followed. In this there is nothing magic or arbitrary, but only a free act producing its natural result. The Mahomedan doctrine is, in its primary article, opposed alike to reason and revelation.

We have dwelt on this point at some length, for from it the two systems of salvation flow. The Mahomedan teaches that, as man was created with sin in him, and the fall was merely the introduction of knowledge and responsibility, being thus a step towards the acquirement of perfection,—the only design of God in sending the prophets is to shew man how to complete the work that Adam began,—how to apply his knowledge of good and evil to the conquest of the latter. The Christian system again teaches, that man having, by his own act, separated himself from God, became guilty, and required the power of God to bring him back, which was accomplished by God himself becoming man, bearing his guilt, and imparting to him strength to return to Himself. Hence the Mahomedan looks to the instructions of the chain of prophets culminating in Mahomed, and the Christian to the sacrifice of Christ and the aids of his Spirit. It appears to us that this fundamental point has not received sufficient prominence from Christian apologists. The Christian truth has been distinctly and fully stated, but the Mahomedan error has not been clearly and decisively exposed. More time and talent have been spent in proving the divinity of Christ, and the propitiatory nature of his death. But what does that avail with opponents who deny the necessity of atonement, and make God the author of man's sinfulness. Let these articles of the Mahomedan creed be overthrown, and the whole of the system falls with it. Let man's primeval purity, and his fall by his own free act, be established, and the mission of Christ becomes a necessity. Sayad Ahmad perceives this, and states it with sufficient distinctness. In fact, the only argument that he brings against Christ's mission is founded on this fundamental view of man's sin not requiring a mediator.

“Christian divines have made it a basis of their faith that, by the disobedience of Adam and Eve, sin has passed upon all men, and therefore all men are guilty. If their sin was pardoned without any punishment, that would be opposed to justice, and if every one had to bear all his own punishment, that would be opposed to mercy. Therefore God gave the promise of a coming Saviour, namely Jesus Christ, who is God himself, but who became incarnate in the form of Christ, who was the seed of the woman, not of the man. . . . But we Mahomedans do not consider this disobedience of Adam and Eve

to have been the beginning of sin, nor do we look on this event as bringing guilt on the human race. We believe this event to have been the cause of the knowledge of good and evil for mankind, by reason of which they have not remained void of responsibility like other creatures. If, therefore, any one will walk according to the guidance of God, he shall obtain salvation; and if any one shall act in a way opposed to it, he shall be punished."—(Pp. 182, 183.)

It will be seen that Sayad Ahmad perceives clearly enough the bearing which the account of the fall has on subsequent doctrine, and he has therefore done well to make the determined stand for his religion that he has made on this primary point, though we believe that he has altogether failed in it.

But while allowing that the Mahomedan system follows logically and consistently from this first error, we by no means allow that it has been consistently worked out. The same untruth which has tainted the fountain has tainted all its streams. Almost the only dogma which they maintain as a means of salvation, is the sinlessness of the prophets. This was not at all necessary for their theory. They required only to maintain the truth and sinlessness of their writings and teaching. But the former is the position required by the words of the Koran, and universally held by them, that all the prophets were sinless from Adam to Mahomet, and if this doctrine be impugned, the Mahomedan position is broken here again. The first prophet that comes under Sayad Ahmad's consideration is of course Adam. It is difficult to see, after the exposition he has given, what sin could be attributed to Adam; but he does allow that he committed a sin of some kind. To reconcile this with the teaching of the Koran, he divides sin into two classes: sins of commission or sins against law, and sins of omission or of negligence. He is led to this because he says it is contrary to God's justice that he should lay on us the doing of anything which it is beyond our power to do. By the former, direct transgressions of the divine commands are meant, by the latter, being defective in the service and respect which God requires of us. As no one can be free from this sin, not even the prophets, their defects would not be considered sins in ordinary men, but only in men who had the privileges of the prophets:—

"From this sin no one is free. The prophets, too, are guilty of it; and this Jesus indicates, when he says in answer to the young man, who asked him, 'Good master, what must I do to inherit eternal life?' * 'Why callest thou me good? for there is none good,

* This is another case in which the English translation of the commentary does Sayad Ahmad injustice. It runs, "Jesus Christ was pleased to say that 'he should not call him good, as there is none good but one, that is God.'" In the Urdu, from which we have translated, he gives the exact words of

save one, that is God.' From the other kind of sin, doing anything against the law, the prophets were free. It is not a sin in ordinary men to do anything with a pure and virtuous motive, but it is sin in prophets, for they must do nothing but what God commands them. It was for this motive that Adam fell under the divine displeasure."—(P. 163.)

We see here again into what a wretched quagmire Sayad Ahmad has fallen, and could not but fall, in his attempts to explain the facts of the Bible in accordance with Mahomedan theories. According to his explanation of Adam's transgression, he was prompted to transgress by the animal part of his nature, *i. e.*, as he explains, Satan. Was that the pure and virtuous motive which brought the divine displeasure on him? Again, he did not fail to come up to a command of God, but he did most decidedly break through an injunction laid upon him. The only result of the fine distinction which our author has drawn, is to make the prophets more guilty than other men. Greater knowledge and higher privilege make certain sins more heinous, though they cannot make that a sin which would not be a sin otherwise. Adam's act would have been sinful in any man; it was, according to Sayad Ahmad's own shewing, doubly sinful in a prophet. Either God has shewn displeasure against an act which was not a sin, or Adam's act was a sin. He would have been far more consistent, however, had he said that God laid on man an unjust prohibition, and that he ennobled himself and the human race by disobeying it.

The only other prophet who comes under consideration in the commentary is Noah, and not the slightest notice is taken of his drunkenness. We do not know whether Sayad Ahmad considers this to have been merely a defectiveness in the service of God, to which Noah was urged by a pure and virtuous motive. But we have no doubt that he would find some means of explaining it away, as well as the falsehood of Abraham the double dealing of Jacob, the adultery of David, the idolatry of Solomon, and the cruelty and sensuality of Mahomed. Yet the word of God, and the consciences of men, alike testify that these are sins in ordinary men, and the only result of Sayad Ahmad's casuistry is, that in prophets they are more heinous sins.

While he thus fails in seeking to reconcile with the Bible any of the distinctive Mahomedan doctrines, he is not more successful in impugning distinctively Christian ones. He has endeavoured to do so by means of philology, and this is the very point in which he is weakest. The question of Christ's mission is brought up in connection with the prophecy that

Christ, and states his own opinion as an inference from them, whereas the English Version misrepresents the words.

the seed of the woman should bruise the head of the serpent. Sayad Ahmad quotes the translation of the Latin Vulgate 'She shall bruise thy head.' He then says it is a very difficult thing to decide whether this translation or that of the authorised English version is the correct one:—

“ In Hebrew the masculine and feminine forms of the pronoun are the same. There is a difference only in the use of the vowel points. If the pronoun be read *hu*, it would be the masculine pronoun, and if it be read *hiv*, it would be the feminine pronoun. There is no connected authority from Moses or Ezra to decide which of these two pronouns it is; but as the Vulgate is a very old translation, very strong and clear reasons must be adduced to prove it false.” — (P. 72.)

He then goes on to say that Christian divines have been obliged to make it applicable to the seed of the woman, for if they did not do so, a fundamental doctrine of their faith would be affected. Sayad Ahmad seems not to be aware that the gender of the pronoun is indicated by the form of the verb. The verb following is in the masculine form *yeshoph*, not the feminine form *teshoph*. The gender of the pronoun therefore does not depend on the vowel points alone but on the verb, and no hypothesis of vowel points can possibly make it feminine. Christian divines have made it refer to the seed of the woman instead of to the woman herself, not because it affects a fundamental doctrine of their faith, but because the rules of Hebrew grammar require them to do so; and they have adopted the fundamental doctrine of their faith to which he refers, because this and other passages of the sacred writings require them to do so.

This brings us to the doctrine of the Trinity, which Sayad Ahmad opposes on like grounds and with like success. He meets it in the third word of the Bible, Elohim or God. The doctrine of the Trinity is not built on this alone, but it comes in as one or a chain of proof. He, therefore, cannot let it pass.

“ The word *Elohim*, is derived from the word *elah*, meaning worship, but this word is not used in the Hebrew. The word *Elowah*, derived from it, is still used among the Jews to signify both true and false gods. *Elohim* is derived from it, and its meaning is gods. It is used also to signify both false gods and the true God. It is also used in the sense of kings, judges, rulers, and angels.” — (P. 41.)

He then quotes its use as applied to Moses, *Exod. vii. 1*, “ See, I have made thee a god to Pharaoh,” to shew that it may sometimes be used as a singular noun—then all cases in which it is used as a noun plural—and concludes, “ Whenever reference is intended to the true object of worship, it is used with a singular meaning, and according to this usage in this

place where the word *Elohim* is used to signify the true object of worship, it signifies only the singular and in no way the plural, and therefore the plurality of the object can in no way be inferred"—(P. 42.) It will be observed that here Sayad Ahmad begs the whole question and misses the whole force of the argument. *Elohim* is derived from *Elowah*, in precisely the same way as gods is derived from God, as in the Urdu word he has used, *Mabudàn* is derived from *Mabud*. Why is a plural form used when a singular is at hand? The only case in point which he cites is that where the word is applied to Moses, and in it God might have said to him, "I have made thee a host to Pharaoh," without any impropriety of language, and without implying that a host means a single person.

In the next verse he meets the doctrine again in the expression, "the Spirit of God." His criticism on it is as follows:—

"The word spirit can in no way mean here the third person of the Trinity, for the word spirit is a noun governed by Elohim or God, and as Elohim has the sign of the plural, the three persons of the Trinity, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, are included in it. As the noun governed is always a distinct thing from the noun governing, this spirit must of necessity be distinct from the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, that is to say, the three constituents of the Trinity. How then can this word spirit mean one of the Trinity?"—(P. 58.)

The absurdity of this quibble becomes apparent if we apply it to any other object. Take, for instance, Gen. xlv. 27, where it is said, "The spirit of their father Jacob revived." According to the above canon of interpretation, this could not mean that Jacob revived, because the spirit here spoken of being a noun governed by the noun Jacob, which includes body, soul, and spirit, must necessarily be something quite distinct from Jacob. He explains the meaning of spirit in this case to be the glory of God. How glory can perform the active functions attributed to the Spirit in this verse, we cannot well understand. The only other case in which the expression occurs in the chapters commented on is in Genesis vi. 3, where God says, "My Spirit shall not always strive with man," in which it is explained to mean the good dispositions of man. It would of course be absurd to say, that "the good dispositions of man brooded on the waters," or that God said, "My glory shall not always strive with man." But this continual change of interpretation, this invention of a new meaning to suit each individual case, is not explaining the word of God, but re-writing it.

His great ingenuity, and at the same time his great ignorance of Hebrew grammar, are most conspicuously displayed,

however, in the explanation he gives of Genesis iii. 22, "And the Lord God said, Behold, the man is become as one of us to know good and evil." He first of all takes up the word *mim-mennu*, which may mean either "of us" or "of it." He gives a full grammatical analysis of it as a pronoun of the third person, according to which he says, it may mean "of it" or "of those." He then proceeds to prove authoritatively that it must be a third person, and in order to do so he quotes in the margin all the cases in which it is used in the Old Testament. It is very true that in three of these cases it has been used to mean "of us," but he says that many arguments might be given to prove that it is much better to look on it as a third person, which arguments he will give when he comes to treat of them in their places ; and so he concludes that it must be a third person, with the meaning of "of it" or "of them." He then takes up the word "Kahad," as he calls it :—

"Another Hebrew word in the verse *Kahad* requires to be noticed. Christian scholars have translated it *one*, whereas it should be translated *unique*, corresponding with the Arabic "wahid." Onkelos, a great Jewish scholar, has translated it "Yahidi," which is the same as *wahid* or *unique*. In many places of the Bible this word occurs with a similar meaning, of which I have noted two in the margin (Job xxiii. 13 ; Song vii. 9). After all these preliminary remarks, then, we may conclude that the exact rendering of the Hebrew word is, 'The worshipped God said, Man is become unique among them (that is, among the creatures), by his knowledge of good and evil.'"
—(P. 174.)

It must be allowed that this is certainly a very ingenious way of getting rid of a troublesome verse, of depriving a Christian doctrine of its support, and bringing it in to the support of a Mahomedan one. It must also be allowed that it is very similar to, certainly not worse than, the interpretation which Onkelos has given. But how does it agree with the facts of the case. The same grammatical analysis which shews that *mim-mennu* may be a preposition construed with a pronoun of the third person, shews also that it may be the same preposition construed with the pronoun in the first person plural. It shews also that, if a pronoun of the third person, it can be only of the third person singular, not of the third person plural. It can mean only "of it," not "of them" or "*among them*" as Sayad Ahmad translates it, and as is necessary to bring his meaning out of the verse. *Kahad* is not one word but two words, *ka*, as, and *ahad*, one. Sayad Ahmad in his translation omits the article altogether, and he gives to *ahad* a meaning not borne out by the passages which he quotes, or by any other in the Old Testament—a meaning which belongs rather to יָחִיד, *yahid*, which is also a Hebrew word. While

doing; then, full credit to Sayad Ahmad's ingenuity, we think that it has been engaged in a vain fight against the plain meaning of Scripture.

We will not pursue the subject any further at present. It must be obvious from what we have said that Sayad Ahmad is no Hebrew scholar. To persons acquainted with the erudition and exactness of European commentaries, it may seem strange that we should have dwelt so long on this work. But it is not merely as a commentary that we look on it, but as the indication of a new movement in the Mahomedan mind. It is the work not of a European but of an Indian Mussulman. He has had none of the advantages in his early training which the former has had. He has been obliged to acquire a knowledge of Hebrew after he had grown up, through a foreign language, amid a press of public business. In such circumstances the wonder is, not that he has not succeeded better, but that he should have done so much as he has. Above all, he has undertaken a work in which the most erudite scholar could not have succeeded, that of interpreting the Bible in accordance with Mahomedan doctrine. Where he has seized the meaning aright, he has done all that ingenuity and subtlety can do to effect his purpose, and he has failed only because he could not possibly succeed. It can scarcely be expected that Sayad Ahmad should complete his commentary on the Bible, though we hope that he may yet be spared to issue a few more volumes, and that, with increasing practice, he may gain increasing exactitude. We rejoice in every step that is made toward a thorough study of the word of God, convinced that it will in the end assert its power, and overthrow all that is opposed to it.

But this commentary is a reproof and a call to the Christian church—especially to the missionary body in India. This is, so far as we know, the first attempt that has been made at a systematic thorough exposition of the Scripture in the most widely diffused language of India, and it has been made not by them but by their opponents, not by a Christian but by a Mahomedan. We trust that there are few of them who are not better able than Sayad Ahmad to write such a commentary. They must have badly improved the advantages of their early training, if they are not. But as yet their ability has borne no palpable fruit. They have long been urging on the Mahomedans the duty of reading the Bible, and now they find themselves in the position, that if their appeals should be successful, the only commentary available is one written by a Mahomedan in support of the Mahomedan faith. It is all very well to talk of circulating the word of God without note or comment; something more than that is needed. It is all very

well to talk of the uselessness and absurdity and expense of printing the Hebrew, which not one Mahomedan in a million can read. The Easterns have their ideas and customs, and according to these they will think and act. No translation of the Koran is ever printed without the original Arabic, no commentary is written in which the original Arabic itself is not quoted. Whatever we may think of the plan Sayad Ahmad has taken, Easterns will see in it evidences of scholarship, care, reverence, and sacrifice for which they will look in vain in any Christian work ; and this will make them regard it as a much better guide both as regards acquaintance with the subject and earnestness of purpose, than any with which Christian teachers have furnished them. The natives of India cannot be expected to discover the errors we have pointed out. They will not believe that they are errors merely by being told that they are. The only method of convincing them is by shewing in a way that they can understand, our superior scholarship and acquaintance with the subject. Sayad Ahmad has intimated his intention of publishing a translation of the Bible in which all those parts, which, according to the Mahomedan theory, are regarded as the word of God, are to be printed in red, and the narrative parts in black. This indicates earnestness and honesty of purpose, and we trust that he will be worthily met by Christian scholars. It is matter of joy that Mahomedans should now be studying the Bible, and it will be a grateful task for those who are labouring for their conversion, to expend what labour they can in enabling them to study it aright.

ART. IV.—*Scottish Christianity and Mr Buckle.*

History of Civilisation in England. By HENRY THOMAS BUCKLE. Vol. II. London : Longmans. Fifth Edition. 1867.

THERE is hardly any problem more perplexing to the Christian mind than the relation which modern literature, in its freshest and most significant forms, bears to evangelical religion. Drawing so largely from the old fountains of Pagan culture, and accustomed to find the standard, not merely of taste, but of character and feeling, in the productions of Grecian and Roman learning, it could not fail to manifest a certain Paganised tone. And though much of existing literature

shews the clear influence of Christian conceptions, and the fruitful working of a genuine Christian spirit, it is still to be feared that, in a special dogmatic sense, there is hardly any phase of our literature more religious than that of the last age. There is certainly a clear advance from the sceptical Epicureanism of the eighteenth century, with its mechanical modes of conception, its tame and narrow spirit, its cold and elaborate classicism ; and Christianity regarded, not as a mere system of notions, with a set phraseology, but as a life, touching thought at a thousand points, has powerfully blended itself with every phase of our literature, imparting to it a higher moral ideal, a more humanised cast of thought, as well as greater vigour, passion, and originality. And yet, if we examine the most popular and pleasing productions of modern times, that have, so to speak, fixed the sentiment of society on a large class of questions—whether we refer to popular novelists, like Dickens and Thackeray, who cannot conceive of religion as associated with a cultivated mind or a warm heart ; or trenchant reformers, like Theodore Parker, who are sound, in the main, upon all social questions ; or the champions of historical liberalism, like Buckle or Lewes ; or the worshippers of force, like Carlyle, with his melancholy “Adieu, O Church ;” or sentimental moralists, like Martineau ; or Broad Church Essayists, like Maurice and Kingsley—we find them all in more or less direct and energetic conflict with the truths of a positive Christianity, and strenuously and contemptuously opposed to every form of evangelical religiousness. The fact is deplorable in the extreme, especially in the present imbroglio of our faiths and superstitions, whether we consider, on the one hand, the danger to Christian habitudes of thought and feeling from such fresh and fascinating works of genius, or, on the other hand, the beautiful uses of literature itself, and the morally exalting power which exists in all its genuine manifestations, even apart from their relations to Christianity.

But there is a class of scientific thinkers who have come in with the era of Positivism, still more unfriendly to, and devoid of all reverence for, positive Christian truth. They shew how fatally modern civilisation has sharpened the edge and envenomed the point of every weapon formerly wielded against the gospel ; indeed, there is nothing in church history to be compared with the “Julian-like intolerance and Lucian-like blasphemy of these writers.” They are worse even than men of the stamp of Walter Savage Landor—the type of the pure *literary* Pagan—who makes apologies for idolatry, and paints in the darkest colours the practices and ideas of Christians. We refer to the small but growing school of philosophical historians and critics, who are trying to transplant

Comtist ideas to English soil, and to subject every branch of human learning and activity to the criticism of the most remorseless *positivité*. They account religion a superstition ; Christianity, a necessary portion of the general mundane evolution, divine only in the sense in which all is divine ; the idea of deity is to be banished from the field of astronomical science, as the study of the *mecanique celeste* has made the idea of divine energy rationally unnecessary ; the belief in a Providence is an irreligious dogma which science has destroyed ; the name of God is a superfluous expletive in accounting for the events and changes of history—in fact, the conception of Deity is itself entirely empiric, a mere generalisation from Asiatic or European experience—and is to be banished from history as it has been from physical science. These prophets of Positivist culture thus very quietly take for granted—what the Christian philosopher most persistently denies—that the conception of history, as a thing of laws and sequences, must necessarily imply atheism, and that those cold, algebraic things, called general laws, cannot be the external symptoms of a divine and ever-working purpose, as if the very earliest notions of order given us in all literature were not associated with the divine agency—"Thou hast given them a law that cannot be broken."

One of the most distinguished disciples of this scientific school of thought was Henry Thomas Buckle, the author of three remarkable volumes on the History of English Civilisation, which have passed silently but securely within ten years into the great chronicle of English fame. This work displays in every page the evidences of an almost incredible industry, a love of labour not to be satiated by any prolixity or minuteness of detail, and a multifarious if not uniformly accurate knowledge, rich with the spoils of all sciences and all times. The writer is quite fearless in his conclusions, no matter how shocking to the instincts and susceptibilities of a Christian age. He follows his logic "down Niagara." We venture to affirm that no writer of modern times has equalled him in the power of evolving from assumed premises, hastily grasped—that are either absolutely or partially false, because they overlook other truths material to the subject—a tissue of such extreme, reckless, and desperate conclusions. He was specially at war with the theological spirit ; and yet, no theologian was ever more dogmatic in his opinions, more scornful in his censures, or more arrogant in his spirit ; and no Calvinist of Scotland ever had a more Chinese cast of mind, or a more stupid contempt than this liberal Englishman for everything that lay beyond the wall of his materialistic philosophy. Mr Buckle delighted in the havoc he made of the most sacred convictions, and principles, and

institutions, that are dear to the holiest men ; he raged against the clergy, Protestant as well as Romanist, with an anger that reminded one of the fury of a wild beast amidst the encircling flames ; and the plain Christianity of Scotland, so different from the grand hierarchical systems, in the absence of all melodramatic pageantry and ancient ceremonial, became the object of the fellest hatred that ever found expression in the literature of any land. Scotland is more superstitious than France, and quite as superstitious as Spain ; the people hold the irreligious dogma of supernatural interference ; instead of cultivating the arts of life, improving their minds, or adding to their wealth, the old generations of Scotchmen passed the greater part of their time in what were called religious exercises ; they were liberal in politics, but illiberal in theology ; the clergy dwarfed the intellect of Scotland, prolonged the reign of ignorance, and stopped the march of society ; they were the enemies of human happiness ; they made the people in religious matters fearful and austere, and coloured the whole national character with that dark hue, which now, though gradually softening, it still retains ; they were harsh and unfeeling masters, who regarded pleasures as sinful and sufferings as religious ; their object was to destroy, not only human pleasures, but human affections ; and in their writings there is a hardness of heart, an austerity of temper, a want of sympathy with human happiness, and a hatred of human nature ; while their influence over Scotland was one of the most detestable tyrannies ever seen in the earth. These casual expressions indicate the regnant spirit of the work, which is that of heartless, indiscriminate, and, we had almost said, malevolent depreciation.

Now, it was the clear object of Mr Buckle, in pursuance of his great plan, to write the moral genesis of the Scottish nation, and to estimate the sum of its contributions to that vast and splendid composite, English civilisation. But, in our opinion, he was singularly wanting in all the necessary qualifications for such an important work. In the first place, he had no sympathy with the religious ideas of the nation, and it is hard for a historian to delineate or understand the characters of men whose chief moral elements belonged to a sphere beyond the reach of his sympathies, to that higher region of human feeling, where piety and patriotism are kindled. He pours contempt upon their religion, ridiculing them, at one time, for their superstition in praying for rain, "the impious contrivance of calling in the aid of Deity to supply those deficiencies in science, which are the result of our own sloth ;" and, at another time, informing them that "a rainbow is that singular phenomenon, with which, in the eyes of the vulgar, some theological superstitions are still connected," while the enlightened people

of this age are informed that "our religion is not to be borrowed from antiquity, but it is to be discovered by each man's mind, it is not traditional but personal." He makes no distinction between the clergy before the Scottish Reformation and the clergy after it, as if they had been still the same unchanged body, exactly identical as to character, tendency, aims, and all but opinion, while he has failed to explain how a body, so incurably selfish and corrupt as the Presbyterian clergy, with not a single redeeming quality but their "democratic and insubordinate tone," could have gathered the whole thought and feeling of the most barbarous and intractable of modern nations into the most compact unity, and wielded it, as he himself admits, against kings and armies, to the utter overthrow of Stuart despotism and the full establishment of our popular liberties. The science of statistics can never measure these men, or shew how the stern Calvinism of the Reformation was the creator of modern society as well as modern liberty, and is still the largest social and political element, in that great civilisation which is the wonder and admiration of the world. But, in the second place, we believe that our author is quite unable to estimate the Scottish nation, on account of his peculiar theory of history. Looking down with, we admit, a well-merited contempt upon those old historians who revelled in antithetical characters and rhetorical commonplaces, he constructs a new theory of historical science, based on statistics,* and matured from the facts supplied by registration tables, and the records of meteorological observation. He has no eye for the moral forces of history, no place for individual human force, an element which it is the special credit of Carlyle to have rescued from undue depreciation, and he has no regard for considerations of race; but climate, scenery, physical characteristics, and large general causes, account for everything. Men are nothing, be they Luthers or Napoleons; the Reformation was the result of the invention of printing, gunpowder, and Greek literature, with Luther, Calvin, and Knox, and three or four kings and

* It is proved (says Mr Buckle) by careful statistics that the same number of people commit suicide every year; that so many are murdered; so many are born and die; and so many are married. Thus we are supplied with positive data for judging of the conduct of men, and constructing the true science of history. But surely the most accurate statistics will not enable us to predict the conduct of any individual man, nor to calculate those eccentric anomalies and inconsistent passions, which are so familiar to the student of history. Statistics have been prepared to shew how many murders are committed annually in the leading countries of Europe and America, but no statistics could have enabled us to predict the assassination of Abraham Lincoln. Statistics prove nothing whatever as to the causes of human action. They are simply a numerical expression of the state of the observer's expectations. They can neither determine nor predict the actions of any individual man.

emperors, thrown in as episodes ; gunpowder destroyed European feudalism ; the mariner's compass gave America to the civilised world. Archdeacon Hare has remarked upon the tendency of the materialistic philosophy to discover the great agents in the history of mankind in mechanical inventions, and not in the Luthers, and Calvins, and Bacons, as if the importance of these inventions lay in themselves alone, and not in the powerful minds that fashioned and shaped them to their ends. The positive philosophers forget that many of our greatest mechanical inventions existed in China for ages without producing any grand revolution in knowledge. "The utility of an invention depends upon our making use of it." According to Mr Buckle's theory, the Reformation, which, be it remembered, in spite of rack and faggot, was firmly established in less than forty years in Germany, France, Switzerland, Holland, and the British Isles, was not a spiritual movement, but political and intellectual. The Scottish Reformation sprang, forsooth, out of a deadly struggle between the nobles and the Romish hierarchy, "the issue of the struggle was the establishment of the Reformation and the triumph of the aristocracy."* This is surely a summary method of explaining the most thorough of all the Reformations. The most self-willed people in Europe are mere cyphers, and appear nowhere on the scene. John Knox comes from Geneva only to find the work already done. "He effected more than any single man ;" but "his influence in promoting the Reformation has been grossly exaggerated by historians, who are too apt to ascribe vast results to individual exertions."† Mr Buckle forgets that, before this period, Knox had been the means of leading many of these very nobles to the truth, that he confirmed their courage by a constant correspondence from Geneva, and that he established the Reformation in the hearts of professors, students, and people, at St Andrews and its neighbourhood, several years before the downfall of the Romish hierarchy. The Scottish Reformation was, in the eyes of our historian, no grand moral struggle, but a petty and deceitful warfare of nobles and priests, issuing in changes that were aided by large general causes, but no more determined by individual exertion or individual character, than the formation of a coral reef is affected by the labours of a single polype.

It will not, then, be considered strange that, according to our author, the genesis of the Scottish religious character is to be found in the constant wars with England, and in the peculiar climate of Scotland, with its mists and storms, predisposing the people to fear and superstition, and fostering

* Vol. ii. p. 280.

† P. 224.

their dependence on the clergy.* While, moreover, the Scotch, being agricultural, were more docile and amenable to clerical influences than the manufacturing classes are usually found to be. Hence, the Scotch people are still, next to the Spaniards, the most superstitious in the world. But now that wars with England have ceased, and that one-third of the whole population of the country has been gathered into towns, how is it that the theological spirit—for that is what our author means by superstition—is still so rampant? It is suicidal for Mr Buckle to say that the spirit of trade began in the eighteenth century to encroach on the old theological spirit, and that two classes—the intellectual and the industrial—arose independently of the theological, to restrict the ecclesiastical power. He ignores well-known historical facts. The theological spirit at the Reformation was always strongest among the manufacturing populations of France, England, Germany, and the Low Countries; and is still stronger in the Scottish manufacturing towns than in the country districts. The towns are still the teeming fountains of religious and moral power.

But Mr Buckle is quite unacquainted with the condition of religious society in Scotland, if he imagines that the clergy ever were the spiritual tyrants of the country. For there never was a nation more ecclesiastical in its whole tone, and yet so practically independent of its clergy. A Scotch clergyman has remarked that the Scotch are a priest-riding rather than a priest-ridden community. And even the author of that wretched *fasciculum* of prelatial calumnies—"Scotch Presbyterian Eloquence"—admits that "The people are truly the guides, and their pastors must follow them whom they pretend to conduct."† They gave their pastors no such power. Their church existed independent of the minister, who owed his office to their free

* The absurd generalisations of our author on this question of climate are very remarkable. He accounts for the fickleness and instability of the Spaniards, Swedes, and Norwegians, by the interruption of agricultural pursuits from climatal causes; but no such fickleness or instability exists. Superstition is said to be most powerful, where earthquakes and volcanoes exist; hence the deep superstitiousness of Spain and Italy; but Scotland is without both, and yet, according to Mr Buckle, is nearly as superstitious as Spain. The Spanish and Italian peninsulas possess the greatest painters and nearly all the greatest sculptors, because, forsooth, countries that are disturbed with earthquakes develop the imagination. Now, we read of only two great earthquakes in Spain and Portugal; but Cervantes, Calderon, Camoens, Murillo, Ribera, and Velasquez, lived before the great earthquake of 1755 which destroyed Lisbon. England, with no earthquakes, has produced the greatest poets; South America, which is continually subject to their action, possesses none. Mr Buckle says that such nations are not scientific, overlooking the remarkable development of scientific genius in Galileo, Torricelli, Galvani, Volta, Leonarda da Vinci, and others. Such is a specimen of the hasty generalisations of our author.

† P. 2, Edit. 1694 A.D.

choice; the will of the majority was its law; and each of the brethren possessed equal rights with the elders as to election. The Reformation in Scotland, in fact, exalted the laity, and the relation was no longer that of priest and people, but of church and minister.* But suppose the people had been a nation of slaves—as our author would represent them—yielding, through abject and ignominious fear, to the behests of an intolerant priesthood, how is it consistent with historical example or with moral possibility, that such a people could be trained by such a clergy, to stand up during many long and bloody years, to fight the splendid battles of constitutional government and popular liberty with no by-ends in view, and display a firmness, a severity, a decision for that which had the validity of sacred truth and conviction, such that no king, nor noble, nor courtier could ever force them again to submit to tyranny? There is a culture, short-sighted and pedantic, that talks such platitudes and admits such marvels; but it is a stranger to all the deeper lessons of history and philosophy.

We tender our acknowledgments to Mr Buckle for the really eloquent manner in which he describes the splendid services of the Scotch, at a most critical period in British history, to the great cause of national liberty.† He refers to the period of the civil wars. But he spoils the effect of his concession by attributing the “democratic tone” of the clergy to their anger against the nobles for stripping them of all but one-sixth of the church revenues at the Reformation.‡ He remarks, too, that “general causes made the clergy love liberty,” as if they had obeyed the promptings of a mere blind instinct. The explanation is miserably false as well as ungenerous. For where has Calvinism ever been the enemy of popular liberty? “How is it,” says Bancroft, the American historian, “that the fanatic for Calvinism has always been the fanatic for liberty?” Our historian must know that George Buchanan—a man, by the way, of a very theological spirit—published his well-known treatise *De jure regni apud Scotos*—a book which may be said to have laid the first stone in the edifice of modern liberalism—before this period, and Dryden informs us that it had the most

* The choice organs of a polite cosmopolitanism at the English press are in the habit of speaking of Scotland as “The Protestant Spain,” “the most priest-ridden country in Europe.” But do they really understand the meaning of this language? Superstition is a blind apprehension for a power vaguely conceived and not to be contended with. Now, the Presbyterian ministers do not exercise any spiritual terrorism; they are not feared as dispensers of eternal perdition, nor courted as the awarders of eternal bliss; but as men of ability, education, and moral worth, they wield that influence which a self-reliant and intelligent nation believes them to merit.

† P. 258-9.

‡ P. 288.

powerful influence on the politics of Milton. We should like to know how it happens that self-government on the grandest scale is only possible in modern times to the most theological peoples? How is it that the English and the American Revolutions* succeeded, and that the French—the least theological ever heard of—ignominiously failed? There never was a revolution more profoundly infidel than that of France, and never one that more miserably and completely failed. This is a *crux* for the Buckle philosophy. One might suppose, from the high place that our author usually assigns to the intellectual classes in the history of civilisation, that they had always been the most intrepid pioneers of popular liberty, and that their complete emancipation, in some instances, from all theological dogmas, had peculiarly fitted them for a fearless grapple with absolutist tyranny. But can it be at all credited that almost their whole political history is that of illustrious meanness, servility, and cowardice? What have the literary classes done for liberty? For two centuries, they have employed their genius in pouring the measureless stores of their vituperation upon the Puritans and Covenanters, who won for them the right to their free and fearless modern discussions. And how does it happen that the six most celebrated infidels of modern times—Hobbes, Hume, Montaigne, Bayle, Bolingbroke, and Gibbon—were the friends of absolutist government—Bayle writing with all his vehemence against “the execrable doctrines of Buchanan,” and “the pretended sovereignty of the people,” without sparing the revolution of 1688; while, on the other hand, men of genius, with much of the theological spirit, like Milton, Locke, Newton, Addison, and Clarke, were the friends of liberty? What is the explanation of these facts? Is it not, first, because your Hobbeses and Humes, with a spirit too feeble and contracted, can never be persuaded to seek redress in forcible resistance, because they have misgivings in every enterprise, and expect little from human wisdom and virtue? And, secondly, is it not because they have no real sympathy with the people? Bancroft says that Puritanism was religion struggling for the people. But the intellectual classes, of the free-thinking order, are only too like the ancient philosophers, who scorned the multitude, and laboured to adorn the top of society. This aristocratism of ancient civilisation, as Neander calls it, has

* From whom did the first declaration of independence issue in America? From Irish Presbyterians, Bancroft says: “The first public voice in America for dissolving all connection with Great Britain came, not from the Puritans of New England, the Dutch of New York, nor the planters of Virginia, but from the Scotch Irish Presbyterians. They brought to the new world the creed, the spirit of resistance, and the courage of the Covenanters.”

nothing in common with that Christianity, which "sounds the bass-string of humanity," and repudiates the spirit of castes and classes. The Calvinism of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries stirred the whole nation, north and south, as the wind shakes the trees of the forest, but only to build up a homogeneous people, of shapely development, rooted in the soil, springing like the oak, and swelling every age with an annulus of development.

Mr Buckle devotes two long and able chapters to an examination of the Scottish intellect in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. It is marked by his usual dogmatism and hatred of Calvinism. He affirms that the clergy dwarfed the intellect of Scotland and stopped the march of society, as if the first grand work of John Knox at the Reformation had not been the establishment of the parochial schools, and an ampler provision for the full development of University instruction. Calvinism has everywhere been synonymous with education as well as liberty. Bancroft says that John Calvin was the founder of the free-school system. The Calvinists of New England established the common schools which now prevail through all the States of America. And what is the true test of any system of education? Its influence on the masses. For the mere result of producing a few scholarly and thoughtful men in comparison with the whole is insignificant compared with that of leavening a whole people with thought and intelligence. "The spirit of dissemination may draw away the sap from the higher studies, but it is the character of our civilisation rather to cast her roots among the people, than to throw her branches boldly in the air." Mr Buckle will hardly maintain that the clergy dwarfed the intellect of Englishmen, and yet it so happens, that in comparison with them, the most clerically disciplined nation is still the best educated.* How is it that the ploughman in Scotland is not what he is elsewhere, a clown? How is it that, in England, they have hardly yet begun to educate the masses? Nearly two centuries ago, Bishop Burnet expressed his amazement at the controversial quickness and metaphysical acumen of the Scottish peasantry. On the other hand, there is scarcely a people in any part of the world more generally dull and ignorant in religious matters, except in districts where the dissenters, who are generally Calvinists, prevail, than the lower and even a large part of the middle-classes in England. Our author is particularly careful to depreciate the

* The per-centage of persons who sign their names on the occasion of their marriage, is greater in Scotland than in England—being in Scotland 88.5 per cent. for men, and 77.2 for women; and in England, 70.5 for men, and 58 for women.

literary renown of Scotland during the seventeenth century ; but the causes of the decline of letters during that period are conveniently ignored. There was, on the one hand, the departure of James I. to England, with nearly all the nobility, and that which gave an impulse to literary honour was thus for a period withdrawn ; while, on the other hand, there were the terrible and bloody persecutions of Charles II., in which the schools were shut up, the colleges deserted, and the country ravaged. And yet, during this dark era, Scotland produced one of the greatest men of genius—Napier, the inventor of logarithms—sent forth a swarm of learned men who taught science and letters in every school of Europe*—produced Alexander Henderson, one of the wisest politicians and theologians of his age, who foresaw the Laudean revivals of after days—George Gillespie, who was a match for debate in the Westminster Assembly for Selden, the prince of antiquaries, for Lightfoot, versed in Talmudic and oriental lore, and for Gataker, the father of English scholarship—as well as Samuel Rutherford, the author of *Lex Rex*, the earliest printed exposition of limited monarchy and constitutional government, on whose devotional letters Mr Buckle pours the most withering contempt—and Andrew Melville, one of the finest scholars of his age. Let it be remembered, too, that some of the most distinguished philosophers and men of letters in Scotland have been clergymen—Reid, Campbell, Beattie, Blair, Robertson, and Chalmers.† But our author makes no allowance for the fact that, while the English Church is the main support of all kinds of learning with her stalls, and mitres, and rich benefices, the church in Scotland was stripped at the Reformation of all those splendid and substantial attractions which incite the ardour of the Southern clergy, and that a considerable portion of the much lauded English theology is due to persons, who, though not in orders, are not working ministers of the gospel. It is impossible that a Scotch minister should sit down to edit a Greek dramatist.

There is the old charge that the Scotch, like the Puritans, condemned and abhorred all elegant studies. Of course, they had no knowledge of the fine arts ; but Ruskin tells us that at the Reformation, the conscience and the taste of Europe went different ways, and we, like other reformed countries, declared for conscience and turned our pictures to the wall. The Scotch

* Innes, p. 280.

† Mr Buckle repeats the trite saying of his school, that the clergy are always opposed to science. Yet, out of thirty-six meetings of the British Association for the advancement of science, no less than nine presidents have been clergymen, including such names as Whewell, Buckland, Sedgwick, and Robinson.

might have cultivated dramatic poetry, music, architecture, the fine arts, but after all æsthetics are but a poor crop to cultivate instead of more essential things. They diffuse weakness, and a turn for ease and present enjoyment, while they never make any people more moral or prosperous or free. Æsthetics are the only outlets to mental activity allowed by despots, and the Scotch had grander work in hand in the seventeenth century. But we utterly deny the charge that the Scotch were opposed to elegant studies, and we demand the proof. Mr Buckle has a low opinion of Scotch intellect because it was so superstitious, and then he dwells with special delight upon the witch delusions and prosecutions of Scotland. We have no disposition to censure him for holding up this enormity to scorn—this grand blot on the good sense and manliness of the Presbyterians—if he will only have the fairness to mention that these trials were not unknown in other countries, and that the intellectual classes by no means held themselves aloof from such delusions and cruelties. Will it be believed that Sir Isaac Newton, the father of physical philosophy, and Sir Thomas Browne, the author of a treatise on “Vulgar Errors,” and Sir Matthew Hale, one of the most humane judges in England, and Sinclair, a scientific Scotchman of much eminence, believed in the delusion and concurred in the execution of witches? The literary classes were by no means in advance of the spiritual classes. Lord Bacon, the author of the *Novum Organum*, was a believer in astrology; and so was the infidel Lord Shaftesbury, the most sagacious statesman in England. They were thus, in reality, behind the theological classes. And who are the superstitious now? Not the religious classes, but the Pantheists, Universalists, and infidels, who accept all the blasphemies and absurdities of spirit-rapping. Robert Owen, the well known infidel communist, was a believer in this shameful imposture.

Our author imagines that he is called upon to account for the fact that, though a fine sceptical literature was produced in the eighteenth century, it did not touch the masses, whose superstitions in consequence remained undiminished.* His theory is, that the intellectual classes could produce no disintegrating effect on the body of Scotch theology, because they followed the deductive instead of the inductive method of

* By superstitions he means evidently their theological opinions, and especially their belief in a Providence, so inconsistent with his ideas of law. He is wrong in thinking that the essence of a belief in Providence is a belief in the irregularity of human events, and equally so in imagining that the Scotch Presbyterians held that Providence extended only to such great events as the Spanish Armada, the Gunpowder Plot, and the landing of William of Orange, without including every single item of which life is made up. Mr Buckle must surely be aware that Jesus Christ taught the doctrine in this sense (Mat. x. 29, 30).

scientific inquiry. But he evidently mistakes generalisation for deduction, and confounds deduction with the deductive method.* We deny that the Scottish writers did not use the inductive method, and we utterly repudiate the assertion that induction is always fatal to the theological spirit, for it is by the induction of instances from the word of God that theology is constructed. Lord Bacon, the author of the inductive method, was a theologian, and said of theology that "it was the Sabbath and port of all man's labours and peregrinations;" and the Scotch who, as our author admits, have now accepted the inductive method, are still as deeply tinged as ever with the theological spirit. In point of fact, Mr Buckle speaks a great deal of nonsense concerning the Baconian method. He uniformly depreciates the past, and especially everything before Lord Bacon, as if all the great men before his age were barbarians, and all their institutions and movements were mere waste of energy. But surely Galileo had demonstrated the true solar and planetary motions, and Kepler had fixed their laws; the telescope, the mariner's compass, the printing press, had been invented, before the *Novum Organum* saw the light; and it was produced, be it remembered, in an age of extraordinary intellectual and experimental activity. There is no difficulty to our mind in accounting for the separate pathways that the intellectual and the theological classes took in the eighteenth century. The free-thinkers, like Hume, had no sympathy with the traditions of national struggle, and others, who were sound in a political sense, were infidels in religion.

Much of his chapter on the Scottish intellect is devoted by our author to an exposure of what he calls the horribly fanatical and austere teachings of the Scottish divines, and accordingly he rakes together, from every quarter, a miscellaneous collection of extraordinary sayings and anecdotes, and scraps from sermons, with the view of demonstrating how the clergy destroyed all human happiness, cast a gloom over the national temperament, and subjected the people to their most debasing control. But it is a disgraceful piece of literary dishonesty for him to ignore the fact that nearly all this literature of gloom and austerity belonged to a period of persecution, when the preachers, deeply stirred by the sufferings they had endured, the jeopardy in which their life stood every hour, and the hair-breadth escapes they had already made, poured forth their burning harangues, not in the strains of scholastic pedantry or artificial rhetoric, but with an all-vital realism which spurns the frippery

* The deductive method includes three things,—an induction, by which a general principle is reached, a deduction from this general principle to a particular fact, and a verification proving the argument to be correct

of art, upon their crowds of listeners, standing forth as patriots to defend the injured rights of their country, or as confessors, to plead for the higher prerogatives of their heavenly King. Mr Buckle sits down in cold blood to anatomise such harangues, delivered while the shots of the bloody soldiery were ringing over the moors, and dying scenes were being enacted in the Grassmarket. He drags to light the literary faults of the preachers, which were the mere asides of grave, and high, and noble speech, picks out sentences that seem grotesque in their isolation, and ignores the weight and wisdom, as well as the bright and sunny qualities, which, in spite of all the darkness and apostacy of the times, constituted the genuine characteristics of the men at whom he flings his haughty scorn. Rutherford, Binning, Durham, Dickson, and Halyburton, are quite unintelligible to a Positivist. Besides, we protest *in toto* against the fairness of accepting without question the extracts of sermons from such works as "Scotch Presbyterian Eloquence," the author of which denied the Scottish persecutions altogether, for we might just as fairly accept the representations of Julian and Celsus upon the nature of Christianity.* We have further to observe, that many of the expressions he quotes as rhapsodical or fanatical are in the very words of the Apostles, and that his sarcastic and ironical commentaries are not by any means honestly based upon, or fairly springing out of, the ample texts contained in his footnotes. For example, he says that "The clergy believed that they alone were privy to the counsels of the Almighty, and that by virtue of this knowledge they could determine what any man's future state would be," on the ground of Samuel Rutherford's remark, quoted from Scripture, "I am free from the blood of all men; I have communicated to you the whole counsel of God." If Dickson says that the power of the keys was given to the church to open and to shut the kingdom of heaven,—in reference, as every one knows, to the power of church discipline,—it means that "the clergy have power to control the future state of men;" if ministers call themselves ambassadors of Christ, "they are guilty of intolerable presumption;" if they teach the Scripture doctrine concerning the devil and hell, "they delight in horrible and revolting ideas;" if Rutherford speaks of the world as "a plaistered, rotten world," "an

* This is his habit. He quotes Theodore Parker for the fact, that there are no distinguished theologians in modern times in Great Britain; and George Combe, the most arrogant and tiresome dogmatist that ever lived, for the statement that there is no country so priest-ridden as Scotland. He speaks, too, of "Peden's Prophecies" as if they were genuine. He seems not to know that they were the compilations of a wandering pedlar, whose credulity was equal to his ignorance.

ashy, dirty earth,"—as it might well appear to persecuted men,—the lesson is that "it is wrong to take pleasure in beautiful scenery;" if Binning says there is no creature so miserable as man, Mr Buckle does not remember that this was a famous saying of Plato; if Durham condemns "palate-pleasers," he is saying that "a Christian must beware of enjoying his dinner;" if Abernethy says, "Men are loth to lend their ear to the Word when they abound in prosperity," he is saying that "it is wrong for a man to wish to advance himself in life, or in any way to better his condition;" if a preacher repeats the well known words of an apostle concerning the love of money, he is sharply admonished by Mr Buckle, that "no passion has done so much good to the world as the love of money;" if Gray speaks of "weaning our affections from all things that are here," he "seeks to destroy human affection,—he says a Christian has nothing to do with love or sympathy;" it is a terrible thing, in Mr Buckle's estimation, to say that pleasures are hurtful to the soul; if the Scotch thought writing poetry a grievous offence, it was when poetry was full of ribaldry, blasphemy, and obscenity; if it was weak for the people to imagine wars in the shape of clouds, calamities in the stars, and a comet as a sign of coming tribulation, they were no wiser than many of the intellectual classes, Lord Bacon himself included, who believed in astrology. Far be it from us to justify the extreme and erroneous interpretations of the Scottish pulpit, and especially the ghastly pictures of future woe, which were too common in *all* the literatures of that age, and for which the poetical and intellectual classes, especially Milton and Dante, are in a main degree responsible; but it is a perfectly gratuitous assumption on the part of our author that this class of subjects formed the staple of all pulpit addresses, and that the clergy, with an insane and one-sided vehemence, never desisted from the preaching of woe. Their published sermons tell another story. Apart from the polemic shape which everything assumed in that age of transition, there was in their discourses a depth, and richness, and warmth of religious sentiment, very different from the weak mixtures of modern religious serialism, springing out of the doctrines of free grace, and deriving its power, as a means of impulse and movement, from them alone. If the world was dark and sad to them, it is no wonder that their sermons should shew it.

Mr Buckle reserves his most pungent sarcasms for the terrible tyranny of the kirk-sessions, which were, it appears, the appointed tribunals for carrying into effect the decrees of the pulpit. Of course, he makes no allowance for the thoroughly corrupt and disorganized condition of Scottish society at the Reformation; and for the general barbarism of the people, for

the lawlessness which had grown up under the shadow of the old hierarchy, for the fatal training of an institution, which was doomed to destruction from its utter immorality and godlessness as a governing power. It is extremely questionable, whether anything but an extreme strictness could have built up an orderly and moral community out of such rude materials, for the masses were singularly coarse and undisciplined in moral feeling, as well as wanting in all the healthful instincts of self-control. The pregnant observation of the *Westminster Review*—a periodical very unfriendly to evangelical Christianity, if not to Christianity itself—in reference to the consistorial discipline of Calvin at Geneva, has a most suggestive bearing upon the subject before us :—“The policy of Calvin was a vigorous effort to supply what the revolutionary movement wanted—a positive education for the individual soul. Government at Geneva was not police, but education—self-government mutually enforced by equals upon equals.” It is well known that there was, in all countries, a fearful dissolution of manners after the Reformation, as we see in the Anabaptism of Germany, and the Libertinism of France ; and the Reformers themselves were alarmed at the fearful prevalence of moral confusion and social licence. Every great crisis in history, every period of change, is fruitful of such almost universal and often of gigantic vice. It was most natural, therefore, that the organizing genius of Reformers like Calvin and Knox, should devise some plan by which the moral life of the Reformation might be, not only saved, but hardened and prepared for the fearful ordeals of persecution in store for it. And if men like Mr Buckle are so severe in their strictures on kirk-sessions’ tyranny, which certainly no man can now defend, they might, at least, keep in mind not only the confused ideas that then universally prevailed respecting the two jurisdictions, civil and sacred, but the remark of a modern writer—that “no mere æsthetic spirit of freedom could have then maintained its ground against the dark plans and the malice of the reactionary interest.” But his strictures are unnecessarily severe. In the first place, we are not quite sure whether Mr Buckle’s prejudice against kirk-sessions does not arise from the fact that they were intended to curb the immoral excesses of the people ; for he has told us that our “appetites, being as much a portion of ourselves as any other quality we possess, ought to be indulged, otherwise the whole individual is not developed.”* Now, though he says immediately after, “that the proper limit of self-indulgence is that a man shall neither hurt himself nor hurt

* Page 408.

others," it is clear that he claims for the individual a wider margin of moral licence than he will find in the ground covered by the ten commandments. It is true that he has but a mean opinion of the moral system of Christianity, which had nothing in it, he says, that it did not borrow from Paganism—as if Paganism ever taught the equality of man before God, the forgiveness of injuries, the dignity of humility, the sanctity of marriage, the equality of the sexes, purity of life, and the rights of the slave—but it is, after all, as Mr Buckle must know, the only system that has had enduring results of a moral and highly elevating nature upon the expanding civilisation of the world. In the next place, he is totally ignorant of the constitution of these kirk-sessions. He says that "the clergyman of the parish selected a certain number of laymen, on whom he could depend, and who, under the name of elders, were his councillors, or rather the ministers of his authority."* The elders owed their appointment, not to the clergyman, but to the free choice of the congregation ; and, so far from being the mere ministers of his authority, they could easily outvote him in deliberation. In the next place, we cannot accept as historical facts the odious slanders of royalist and prelatie enemies, in reference to the work of these religious tribunals. The Puritans of New England were for several generations exposed to scorn and ridicule for the famous "Blue Laws" of Connecticut, which prohibited a husband from kissing his wife and a mother her child on the Sabbath day ; but it is now discovered that no such ridiculous laws ever existed. The Rev. Mr Lyon, in his History of St Andrews, mentions that some of the Scotch clergy, in drawing up regulations for the government of a colony, inserted an exactly similar clause, and we believe it to be a perfectly gratuitous slander. The kirk-sessions, we believe, must have many a time exercised a too inquisitive control over the conduct of members ; but let it be remembered, that if they condemned dancing and gaiety, it was mostly in a time of persecution and calamity ; if they condemned "penny-bridals," it was in the interest of the poor, as well as of decency and sobriety ; if they forbade plays, there was hardly a comedy of the seventeenth century that did not make adultery its staple, and the subject of laughter ; and they were discountenanced, as people now discourage the reading of Dumas, or Balzac, or Sue ; if they forbade travel in Popish countries, they were only following in the track of a prelate, Bishop Hall, who in his *Quo Vadis?* informs us, that young gentlemen, in taking the tour of Italy, the Sodom of that age, became fops and profligates, as well as Papists ; if they maintained the Sabbath-laws

with strictness, they were only carrying out what a Scotch Parliament of laymen had enacted. We presume it was through the moral discipline of these tribunals that the people, as Kirkton tells us, became so sober, and so free from the vice of dishonesty—for “the taverners’ ordinary lamentation was that their trade was broke, the people were become so sober”^{*}—and that, after the Restoration, when a flood of licentiousness overspread England, and priest and people were become equally profane, the high moral spirit of Scotland checked and counteracted the progress of the alarming evil.

It is quite evident that Mr Buckle’s quarrel with Scotch Calvinism is a quarrel with the theological spirit everywhere.[†] And yet he does not see that this spirit not only underlies all the grandest movements of the past, but is still the animating spirit of the greatest social, intellectual, and political combinations of the present age. There is a literary sciolism which regards religion merely as a social accomplishment, almost as one of the fine arts, or as a mere ornament of civilisation, but denies to it all powers to restrain, direct, or inspire the conduct of men. This is the mere empiricism of a shallow and flip-pant philosophy, with which we cannot afford to hold a moment’s discussion. But people like Mr Buckle cannot be allowed to ignore historical facts. Calvinism built institutions for men, as well as men for institutions. It founded, as we have seen, our civil and religious liberties. It built up a nation in America, next to Scotland, the most Calvinistic in the world, and, with hardly an exception, the most progressive and prosperous, now draining every monarchy of Europe to replenish its vast territories with a polyglot of tongues, and expanding swiftly, even through disaster and blood, into an almost unparalleled greatness.[‡] Calvinism was the spring of Dutch greatness. France cast out its Calvinism, and has ever since been oscillating between the extremes of despotism and anarchy. Its popular movements have been after Calvinist example, and would have been more successful, if they had caught the spirit,

^{*} Kirkton’s MS. History.

[†] We hold Calvinism to be the strongest embodiment of the theological spirit, though the latter, we know, may be Arminian as well as Calvinistic; but, in point of fact, Arminianism is only powerful, so far as it grasps the leading principles of Calvinism—not in precise dogmatic form, but in practical scope and spiritual tendency. There is a vast difference, for example, between the evangelical Arminianism of Wesley and Fletcher, and the Pelagian Arminianism of Tomline and Whitby. The one is much nearer to Calvinism than the other.

[‡] What a remarkable difference there was between the Massachusetts colony, founded by the Puritan clergy and people, and Carolina, settled under the auspices of the English nobility, and its fundamental laws framed by Shaftesbury, the most sagacious statesman, and Locke, the most famous philosopher, of England!

while aiming at the results, of Calvinism. Perhaps, however, these facts have no weight with a historian who believes that a nation's progress depends, not upon moral, but intellectual causes. But, even upon his own theory, how will he account for the fact, that nations so intensely theological have been the most intellectual, and therefore the most progressive?*

Our author attaches great importance to literature as an element of progress, but it must be a literature hostile to the theological spirit, and in more or less alliance with the aims of positivism. But all that is really original, or wholesome, or cleanly, in our modern literature, is tinged more or less with the theological spirit. Take, for example, the moral teachings of Thomas Carlyle—who is, unquestionably, one of the representative men of modern literature—and whose writings, on all kinds of questions, are very fascinating, and, as some people think, very profound and original. Let us quietly ask, Whence this moral teaching? It may be very original to say that to be is better than to seem, that there is an inner light of conscience teaching right and wrong, that there is work appointed to every man, which he will neglect at his peril, that it is good to reverence work, that many evils exist in the world, that many shams are popular, and that if we could find out the ablest man among us, some grand aristocrat, say, with rhythmic drill, and give him due authority, these would be remedied. But surely these are not new doctrines. They are just the moral principles—bating that aristocratic drill-sergeant—of the old forsaken Calvinism which Mr Carlyle imbibed at the Seces-

* His theory is, that morals are stationary, and intellect is progressive; and therefore intellect is the parent of modern progress and civilisation. The principles of morals are, no doubt, stationary, but their applications are not so. They are stationary like mathematics, but who can estimate the boundless developments of mathematics in astronomical and physical science? Why have India and China remained stationary for three thousand years? They have had a wonderfully high intellectual culture during those ages. Is it not from their miserably low moral position as idolatrous nations? Why has Europe, with a higher morality, been progressive? And why have the Roman Catholic nations been so far outstripped by the Protestant, in prosperity, intellect, and enterprise, but from the difference in their moral training? Mr Buckle maintains the soundness of his theory from the fact, that war has become less frequent in modern times, from the spread of knowledge, and not from moral considerations which must have existed for hundreds of years. But war has not become less common in modern ages, and, strange to say! it is the most enlightened nations, such as England, America, and Prussia, that are the most warlike. He affirms, besides, that religious persecution has ceased in modern times, on account of their superior enlightenment, and not from moral causes, inasmuch as the best of men have been persecutors. But he must know that the best defences of toleration have come, if not from theologians, at least from men with the theological spirit; and, as has been well pointed out, the worse persecutions that were ever aimed at the existence of Christianity belonged to the most enlightened period of Roman civilisation.

sion Church of Ecclefechan. The ethical part of our more refined literature—even that which is hostile to evangelical Christianity—is a mere plagiarism from it. Whence has modern literature acquired its subjectiveness, as well as its earnest and generous purpose? Subjective writing, or that form of literature that gives prominence to the personal life, has been borrowed from the Puritans, from the classical age of experimental as well as dogmatic theology. Till a comparatively recent period, literary men devoted themselves to the world of sense, picturing the various objects that constitute the scenery of existence, and tracing the paths which wind among them in the shifting light of an uncertain destiny. But the higher forms of literary work, of which we have many modern instances, owe their charm to their subjectiveness, the authors laying their scenes, not so much in the external sphere of human experience, as within the soul itself, picturing the soul and its sorrows, its ecstasies, and its longings for rest. This is Puritan. Thomas De Quincey is the best example of this kind of writing. Circumstances, not outward, but in their inward reproduction, the lightning that scathes the brain and shatters the heart, the hurricane and strife within the soul, the vision opened to heights that tower in the firmament, or to abysmal depths that are cleft below us, the intimate and inseparable alliance between the intensities of human affection and the vast issues of eternity—these are the passion of his literature, and they come, in their spirit and intensity, from the classics of Puritan devotion, and remind one of the thoroughness of Puritan self-scrutiny, with this special difference, however, that the latter is not weakened by that intense, obtrusive, diseased self-consciousness which has become too much the fashion in the world of letters.

Shall we speak of Calvinism in its social triumphs and moral reforms? It has always concentrated in itself an unbounded energy of wholesome change. Judged even by the standard of that gross materialism, which looks at everything in the point of view of its immediate utility and results, it holds a vital place among the forces of society. While men like Carlyle, and the weekly organs of polite literature, array themselves against all the humanity of our era, hopeless of the future, picturing the diseased realism of modern life, with the interest of an artist or a Chesterfieldian *roué*, and not with the earnest purpose of a reformer—either loud in the glorification of force, or in a spirit of miserable *dilettantism*, discoursing concerning Philistinism, vulgarity, and the dissidence of Dissent, as the three great evils of an age of culture—the theological spirit is quietly and incessantly at work in every department of reform, leading the way in every move-

ment that can humanise society or relieve the pressure of human suffering. It is the boast of Bancroft, that the New England Puritans were far ahead of the English in criminal reforms; they had a most humane criminal code, they never hanged for theft. The charitable system established by John Knox over the length and breadth of Scotland, making each congregation the guardian of its own poor, was one of the wisest economies, for it repressed all attempts at professional mendicancy, and had much to do in nourishing that high self-respect which makes the Scotch beggar so rare a curiosity. It is needless to speak of the missionary heroism of Calvinism. The triumphs of self-sacrifice are not certainly to be found among rationalist divines or positivist philosophers. Even Lecky, in summing up the triumphs of rationalism, makes the honest admission that it is as much an enemy to devotedness and self-sacrifice as it is to ignorance and error.

In concluding this review of Mr Buckle's examination of Scotch Christianity and the Scotch intellect, we cannot but express our surprise that he should have discovered only a single admirable quality in the people, namely, their devotion to civil liberty and national independence. Yet, this implies a very great deal—an intense individualism, unshaken self-reliance, abounding energy, and passionateness of conviction. These are still the traits of Scotchmen. Their spirit is, no doubt, less fierce; it runs in other channels, but it flows on as deep and strong as in the old battle-cries for liberty and independence. There are some natures so thin and feeble that there is no anchorage in them for strong convictions; but it is the testimony of a High Church enemy that, in no other country in the world but Scotland, is there a greater amount of active conviction on the subject of religion. We resent the accusation of national superstitiousness as a libel. Mr Buckle knows that there was no deference to ancient superstitions at the Scottish Reformation; the thoroughness of the work was checked by no concrete and historical sympathies as happened unfortunately in England; ten centuries of prescription were nothing to the reformers against one text of Scripture; they could not keep themselves conveniently in the dark like their southern brethren, or “let logical contradictions dwell together in harmony.” They resolved that, at least in Scotland, there should be no *tolerabiles ineptiæ*, no Romish principles left to become the seeds of Laudean revivals; and so it was never to be, that several hundreds of her clergy and nobility should go over to Rome, or that, amidst the utter godlessness of the time, she should be torn asunder by idiotic controversies about the kind of spiritual millinery a priest should wear in celebrating the holy eucharist, or in mumbling out the gospel in a mediæval

monotone. It was never to be that her preachers, after the choral pantomime, should try to edify the people by a few sorry sentences concerning priestly power, the sanctification of baptismal water, the merits of St Chad, patristic scraps, and apocryphal quotations. The Scotch have always been superior to superstitions of this degrading order; but if Mr Buckle means to call believing in a Providence superstitious, then undoubtedly they are pre-eminently so. But it is the superstition of strength, not of weakness; it is the superstition that feels the pressure of great eternal laws, that cherishes the supernatural element in all the life of man. No more than the religious of other nations, can the Scotch tolerate the restrictions of materialism; for it is a foe to their whole nature, to their intellect no less than to their sensibilities, to their religious instincts as well as their sensuous faculties, and, compelled as they are by the acceptance of Christianity as a revealed message of mercy and love to man, to acknowledge the near connection of all their interests with the evolving issues of the universe, they cannot escape the deep and heartfelt conviction that eternity is ever pressing on the minutest incidents of their history. These were the men, and this was the manner of their superstition. Mr Buckle has not, so far as we can remember, charged them with hypocrisy. He knows too well—what cavalier historians and royalist poets always forgot in slandering the Puritans—that irresolution is and must be the characteristic of all who hold a double character, and that the Covenanters as well as the Puritans were, as a body, far too decided in their principles and policy to merit this stale and odious accusation.* He is quite certain, however, that they were very sour, and austere, and fanatical, just as their descendants still are, as well as the enemies of human happiness and averse to innocent amusements.† Certainly obloquy and persecution are apt to sour the very sweetest natures, but exactly the same charge was brought against the Calvinists of France, simply because they refused to mingle in the gaieties and festivities of their neighbours, and rebuked the indolence and poverty of the Roman Catholics by their industry and success in trade. Our author is particularly incensed at the ecclesiastical tone of Scotch society, and the extreme illiberality of sentiment that prevails upon all religious

* Even infidels, who regard hypocrisy as the worst of all offences, are not always models of consistency upon this head. Thomas Jefferson, President of the United States, had the hardihood actually to propose a resolution in Congress, appointing a day of national prayer, fasting, and humiliation.

† This is a pure libel. They were enemies to sinful amusements, but they practised all manly sports from childhood. Professors in universities, as well as students, joined in them, and ministers were present at them.

and ecclesiastical questions. Now, though we are perfectly at one with Mr Buckle in believing that liberality of spirit, exhibited in a practical form, is one of the best and truest attributes of civilised life, we are perfectly convinced that, judged by a practical standard, the Scotch are more liberal than the English. For example, the English Church unchurches the Scotch, the Scotch recognise the church-standing of the English. The English universities have always been kept as ecclesiastical preserves, or governed as mere appendages of the English Church, and on the most narrow and bigoted principles; so that though dissenters may gain a few of its prizes, no dissenter can be allowed to fill one of its chairs. On the other hand, there is no such connection in Scotland between the universities and the church, and there is no such exclusion of dissenters from the professorial chairs. Some people think, however, that Scotch theology is far too rigid and unaccommodating, and that it would be a real advantage to the religion of the country, to have it weakened and desolated by that philosophical pestilence which rages so furiously in the bosom of English Christianity. We have no sympathy with a religious liberalism of this order, and yet no real friend of that massive structure of British theology which was "reared two centuries ago by the piety and genius of the Westminster divines," will object to see an ethically disciplined, metaphysical spirit, operating according to the canons of a well-applied logic, under the increasing light of Biblical science, working towards the fuller development and elucidation of a richly intellectual and profoundly scriptural theology. But sure we are that the Scotch mind will never yield to that miserable cowardice of unbelieving, so boldly insinuated by Mr Buckle, that the more man advances in intellectual, moral, and social culture, the more will God turn away his face from him. This is the miserable doctrine of that scepticism which has been well named the suicide of the soul, and whose warmest dreams and moral aspirations, if such can be at all imagined, will never secure its disciples from the most terrible attacks of hopelessness and despair.

T. C.

ART. V.—*Tyndale and the English Bible.*

The Annals of the English Bible. By CHRISTOPHER ANDERSON. Vols
London: William Pickering.

Foxe's Acts and Monuments of the Church. London.

The Church History of Britain. By THOMAS FULLER, D.D.

FROM the tenth to the thirteenth century, theology, as a science, was more and more studied simply as a philosophy. The Scriptures were not appealed to as determining the form of Christian dogmas. The schoolmen sought to elucidate and develop theology by speculation and the dialectics of Aristotle. This system culminated about the middle of the thirteenth century. At that time, amid the noisy conflicts of the *Thomists* and the *Scotists*, a voice was heard in England calling the attention of students to the Bible as the fountain head of all religious truth. It was Robert Grosseteste (or Capito), a teacher at the university of Oxford, and afterwards Bishop of Lincoln, who took the lead in the reactionary movement against the scholasticism of the middle ages. He held up the word of God as the great standard of authority. But he went further than even this. He spoke out in favour of a translation of the Scriptures into the vernacular languages. "It is the will of God," said he, "that the holy Scriptures should be translated by many translators, and that there should be different translations in the church, so that what is obscurely expressed by one, may be more perspicuously rendered by another." Capito died in the year 1253. A century must pass away before practical effect begins to be given to this idea. Robert of Sorbonne, a teacher at Paris, and founder of the *Sorbonne*,* and Cardinal Hugo de St Caro (St Chers, at Vienne), exerted no little influence in the same direction; but the growth of opinion in favour of the Scriptures was very slow.

About the middle of the fourteenth century we find Richard Fitzralph, the primate of Ireland, standing prominently out among his compeers as a diligent student of God's word. So ambitious was he to collect books, that he "sent four of his secular chaplains from Armagh to Oxford, who sent him word again that they could neither find the Bible nor any other good profitable book in divinity meet for their study, and therefore were minded to return home to their own country." His studious habits and his love for books were participated in by many around him. He says of himself that "the Lord had taught him and brought him out of the

* The Theological Faculty of the University of Paris.

profound vanities of Aristotle's philosophy to the Scriptures of God." It is said that he translated the New Testament into the Irish language. He died in the year 1360. At that time Wyckliffe had already entered on his important labour at Oxford, in expounding and defending the truth.

Wyckliffe, who has justly been styled the "morning star of the Reformation," was born in 1324 and died in 1384. When he was about forty years of age, he began to take a prominent part in the great controversy then rising into national importance in England, between the spirit of liberty then growing up among the people, and the spirit of civil and ecclesiastical tyranny which animated the whole Romish system, and under which the nations groaned. Wyckliffe became the acknowledged leader in that movement. His publications were circulated far and wide throughout the land. They were even carried abroad into other countries, and everywhere kindled in the bosoms of multitudes an ardent desire for the liberty wherewith the truth makes free. Those who, under the leadership of Wyckliffe, threw off the yoke of Romish superstition, and clung to the simple truths of the gospel, as the very life of their souls, became the objects of bitterest hatred on the part of the priests, whose authority they renounced. They were cruelly persecuted. They were imprisoned, were despoiled of their goods, were tortured and put to death with all the refinements of fiendish cruelty. Notwithstanding all this, the Lollards—for so they began to be called—continued to increase in number. Those who had been students under Wyckliffe at Oxford University, wandered about the country preaching the word from house to house, and sometimes more openly to multitudes of eager listeners, and the gospel prevailed till it would almost seem as if England would rise in the majesty of a ransomed nation and cast off for ever the thralldom of the Antichristian yoke. But there were coming dark and troublous times. The fires of persecution became the fiercer. The Lollards were everywhere hunted as beasts of prey. They met together in dens and caves of the earth. The tracts and books published by Wyckliffe were industriously copied and circulated amongst them long after their great leader's death. They could but suffer and pray, and hope that God would yet send them deliverance. Generations passed away, children learning from their fathers the truths of God and inheriting their faith, and yet the day of deliverance dawned not. Long and weary was their waiting, yet their hope did not give way. All seemed to be against them. The combined civil and ecclesiastical authorities sought their complete destruction. Yet they perished not from out the land. They

lingered on till the glorious morning of the Reformation dawned upon them in all its cloudless splendour.

Wyckliffe's great work, and that by which the spirit of the Reformation was mainly nurtured in England, was his translation of the Bible in the English language. This was accomplished about the year 1380. The Lollards prized the Bible, thus given to them in their own language, above all things. But they possessed it not without the peril of their lives. They had to read it in secret and by stealth. They gathered together in little bands in some retired cottage, or in some remote glen or mountain fastness, to read together from the precious book. The priests and monks instituted strict search, and wherever they could find the obnoxious volume or any part of it, they committed it to the flames and cast its possessors into prison—the civil authorities giving effect to the cruel persecuting decrees of the rulers of the land.

For many a long and weary day were the Lollards the objects of relentless cruelty. Darkness again seemed to be about to settle down over the land. No one dared to utter his voice in favour of the truth. Popery, which had been so valiantly assailed and almost wholly overthrown by Wyckliffe, once more triumphed. But time wore on, and events were rapidly maturing toward a second and more widely spread, and more complete revolution in the religious history of England.

In the year 1509, king Henry VIII. ascended the throne of England. He professed to be a great patron of learning, and the scholars of that age, with Erasmus at their head, hailed his coronation as the bringing in of a new era. Henry married Catherine of Aragon, daughter of Ferdinand. She had been the wife of his brother Prince Arthur, who had died in 1505. The Pope, Julius II., by a special dispensation, allowed the marriage to take place.

Wolsey, a priest, having obtained the office of almoner under Henry VII., became, on the death of that king, a great favourite with Henry VIII. He was an ambitious, unscrupulous ecclesiastic. He at length rose to the dignity of Lord Chancellor of England and Papal Legate. He had reached the very summit of his ambition. In his palace he surrounded himself with royal pomp and splendour, and when he appeared in public, the retinue which accompanied him was brilliant and imposing. The clergy of England had declared themselves as above the law of the land. They maintained that, as the anointed of God, the civil authorities could have no control over them. They could only, they affirmed, be tried before an ecclesiastical tribunal. Wolsey

boldly upheld this priestly supremacy. "Sire," said he to Henry, "to try a clerk is a violation of God's law." The king was by no means disposed to acquiesce in this doctrine. He replied, "By God's will we are king of England, and the kings of England in times past had never any superiors but God only. Therefore know you well that we will maintain the right of our crown." The Parliament of England was now again, as it had been in the days of Wyckliffe, weary of the arrogant pretensions of the clergy, and resisted their claims. The old conflict between the civil and ecclesiastical authorities was about to be renewed.

The priests manifested everywhere a furious hatred against all such persons as were suspected of heresy. We read of persons in diverse places being seized and condemned as Lollards, and burned. The priests saw that there was growing up in England a band of men of learning, trained by Erasmus, who was then in London, whose spirit and aims seemed to threaten the overthrow of the whole ecclesiastical system. They looked on this new movement with the greatest suspicion. Erasmus first came over to this country from Holland in 1497. He came for the purpose of studying the Greek language at Oxford, under the celebrated Grocyn. "Here," he says, "I have met with humanity, politeness, learning—learning not trite and superficial, but deep, accurate, and true; and withal so much of it, that but for curiosity, I have no occasion to visit Italy." After a residence of two years at Oxford, he went over to Paris and pursued his studies at the University there for three years. He then went over to Italy. In 1509 he returned to England, and became Professor of Greek at Cambridge, where he remained till 1514. He stood high in public favour as one of the first learned men in England. On account of some sarcastic remarks he had made concerning the priests, he became the object of their bitter hatred. They resolved to deal with him as a heretic. To escape their persecution he fled to the continent, and took up his residence for a time in the city of Basle. Here he issued from the printing press of Frobenius the New Testament in Greek, with a Latin translation. The art of printing, discovered by John Gutenberg about 1435, was by this time practised in all the chief cities of Europe. About the close of the fifteenth century there were no fewer than a thousand printing presses briskly at work in 220 different towns of Europe. A mighty change was silently and rapidly passing over the face of the world.

The publication of Erasmus's Greek Testament (A.D. 1516) was an event of the greatest importance. It was printed now for the first time. It was rapidly conveyed over to Eng-

land, and was eagerly read by learned men in London, Oxford, and Cambridge. Great interest was awakened concerning it. It gave rise to much discussion, and was heard of all over the land. Erasmus, in his letter written at that time, thus refers to this publication, "It is not from human reservoirs fetid with stagnant water that we should draw the doctrines of salvation, but from the pure and abundant streams that flow from the heart of God"—"If the ship of the church is to be saved from being swallowed up by the tempest, there is only one anchor that can save it; it is the heavenly word, which, issuing from the bosom of the Father, speaks and works still in the gospel." In this book, received with so much enthusiasm among the learned men in England, the priests and monks soon discovered that they had a most dangerous enemy to encounter. They spoke of it as a heretical, dangerous book, and were quite wild in their denunciations of it. They said, "If this book be tolerated, it will be the death of the Papacy." "If we do not stop this leak," said the Archbishop of York, "it will sink the ship." Standish, Bishop of St Asaph, said masses against it. "Times full of danger," said he to the king, "are come upon us. A book has just appeared and been published too by Erasmus. It is such a book, that if you close not your kingdom against it, it is all over with the religion of Christ among us." Everywhere the priests were loud in their anathemas against the Greek New Testament, and against all who favoured it. And it was not without reason that the priests were so much alarmed. They feared that this innovation would lead to another still greater—the printing of the book in the English language. They knew that Erasmus had said, "Perhaps it may be necessary to conceal the secrets of kings, but we must publish the mysteries of Christ. The holy Scriptures translated into all languages, should be read not only by the Scotch and Irish, but also by Turks and Saracens. The husbandman should sing them as he holds the handle of his plough, the weaver repeat them as he plies his shuttle, and the wearied traveller halting on his journey, refresh himself under some shady tree with these goodly narratives." The translation of the Scriptures into the language of the people was a new idea to the men of that generation.

Whilst the priests and monks were everywhere expressing their horror and indignation at the spread of the art of printing, and at the enthusiasm with which the Greek New Testament was studied, Tyndale was a student at Oxford, and afterwards at Cambridge, where he resided till 1519. During his residence at the universities, he acquired an accurate acquaintance with the Greek and Hebrew languages.

He had much about him of the old Lollard spirit. He delivered lectures to the students and fellows of Magdalen College, which resembled in their whole character those which had been long before delivered by Wyckliffe to the students of his time. In 1519 Tyndale left Cambridge, and became for two years tutor to the family of Sir John Walsh at Little Sodbury Manor House. He generally during that period preached on the Sabbath at the towns and villages in the neighbourhood. He held many a keen discussion also with the abbots and other clergy, who were frequent visitors at Sir John Walsh's. "This gentleman," says Foxe, "as he kept a good ordinary at his table, there resorted to him many times sundry Abbots, Deans, 'Fat Rectors,' Archdeacons, with diverse other doctors, and great beneficed men; who there, with Master Tyndale sitting at the same table, did use many times to enter into communication. Then Tyndale, as he was learned and well practised in God's matters, so he spared not to shew unto them simply and plainly his judgment; and when they at any time did vary from his opinion, he would shew them in the book and lay before them the manifest places of Scripture to confute their error and confirm his sayings." "Your Scriptures only make heretics," cried the priests. "On the contrary," replied Tyndale, "the source of all heresies is pride; now the word of God strips man of everything and leaves him as bare as Job." "I tell you," cried one of the priests, "that these Scriptures of yours are a Dædalian Labyrinth rather than Ariadne's Clue—a conjuring book where everybody finds what he wants." "Alas," replied Tyndale, "you read them without Jesus Christ; that's why they are so obscure to you"—"you set candles before images," said he, "and since you give them *light* why don't you give them *food*? Why don't you make their bellies hollow and put victuals and drink inside? To serve God with such mummeries is treating him like a spoilt child, when you pacify him with a toy or with a horse made of a stick." These were brave words at such a time. But Tyndale was also serious in his arguments. He had always the New Testament at hand, and could turn to it and say, "Look and read." It happened on one occasion that Sir John and Lady Walsh—"a stout and wise woman," as Foxe calls her—were dining with the great church dignitaries of the district, in the house of the Archdeacon, when a discussion arose on the great public question of the day, Erasmus's New Testament and the new learning. On their return home Lady Walsh began to reason with Tyndale on these matters. He respectfully exposed the errors of the priests, and maintained the truth.

Dame Walsh could not reply to his arguments, but said, "There was such a doctor there as may dispend a hundred pounds, and another two hundred, and another three hundred pounds; and what, were it reason, think you, that we should believe you before them?" "No, it is not me you should believe," said Tyndale. "That is what the priests have told you; but look here, St Peter, St Paul, and the Lord himself say quite the contrary." By his conversation and his teaching, Tyndale exerted no little influence on the family with whom he resided. A work by Erasmus, entitled the "*Enchiridion Militis Christiani*," or "*Christian Soldier's Manual*," was translated by Tyndale and presented to his patron. That book tended to deepen the impression made by his teaching. Gradually Sir John looked with less complacency on the priests. They soon saw that they were not so welcomed to Sodbury Manor as they had formerly been. They attributed the change to Tyndale. He became the object of their bitter hatred and reviling.

Tyndale continued to grow in the depth and power of his religious convictions. He tells us how his mind was directed to the work of translating the New Testament into the English language: "Because," says he, "I had perceived by experience how that it was impossible to establish the lay people in any truth except the Scriptures were plainly laid before their eyes in their mother tongue, that they might see the process, order, and meaning of the text; or else, whatsoever truth is taught them, these enemies of all truth [the priests] quench it again—partly with the smoke of their bottomless pit, that is, with apparent reason of sophistry and tradition, of their own making, and partly in juggling with the text, expounding it in such a sense as is impossible to gather of the text itself. It was in the language of Israel that the Psalms were sung in the temple of Jehovah, and shall not the gospel speak the language of England among us? Ought the Church to have less light at noon-day than at dawn? . . . Christians must read the New Testament in their mother tongue." The thoughts then cherished soon ripened into action, not without great peril, as we shall see, to Tyndale. The priests were resolved to put a stop to the proceedings of the audacious scholar, and they summoned him to appear before the chancellor of the diocese. "When I came before the chancellor," says he, "he threatened me grievously, and railed at me, and rated me as though I had been a dog." Escaping from the chancellor, Tyndale again returned to the hospitable mansion of Little Sodbury. Shortly after this, on one occasion, a learned divine, with whom he had a discussion on the authority of the Scriptures, exclaimed,

in reply to one of Tyndale's arguments, "We were better to be without God's laws than the Pope's." This reply was more than Tyndale could well bear, and, in the excitement of his feelings, he answered, "I defy the Pope and all his laws; and if God spare my life, ere many years I will cause a boy, that driveth the plough, to know more of the Scriptures than you do."

It now became evident to Tyndale that it was not safe for him to remain any longer in that part of the country. He looked about him for some place of refuge, where he might reside, and carry out his cherished purpose of translating the New Testament into the English language. He first thought of Tunstal, the Bishop of London, as a person most likely to encourage him in his undertaking. He expected that if he could be permitted to enter into the bishop's service, all would be well. He made application accordingly, but he met with a disappointment. The bishop said that his house was full, and he had more people than he could employ. Greatly disheartened, Tyndale searched about for employment in the metropolis, but could find none. Meanwhile a wealthy merchant, Mr Humphire Munmouth, took pity on the friendless scholar, and most kindly entertained him in his house for six months. While residing here, he sometimes preached in the church of St Dunstan's in the West. "By his conversation and his works he shed over the house of his patron the mild light of the Christian virtues, and Munmouth loved him more and more every day." Tyndale thus speaks of that period of his residence in London:—"And so in London I abode almost a year, and marked the course of the world, and heard our preachers how they boasted themselves and their high authority; and beheld the pomp of our prelates, . . . and understood at the last not only that there was no room in my lord of London's palace to translate the New Testament, but also that there was no place to do it in all England."

Though very strongly attached to his native country, he was now firmly resolved on going abroad, that he might carry out his ardently cherished desire. His kind host Munmouth "helped him over the sea." He sailed direct from London to Hamburg, having received from Munmouth the sum of ten pounds, equal in value to about a hundred and fifty pounds of our present currency. He afterwards sent him over other ten pounds, that Tyndale might not be dependent on the hospitality of foreigners. One William Roye, a Franciscan friar from Greenwich, joined him while at Hamburg, and for some time acted as his amanuensis, while he was engaged in his work. In the month of May 1525, he

left Hamburg, and, accompanied by Roye, went over to Cologne, on the Rhine. There he commenced his great work of committing to the press his Translation of the New Testament. It was in the form of a quarto volume. The printers had, however, proceeded only to the tenth sheet, when they were interdicted by the authorities from going on with their work. The great enemy of their undertaking was one John Cochlæus, deacon of the Church of the Virgin at Frankfort. "He rose above all his contemporaries of the sixteenth century; and, with an unwearied perseverance worthy of a better cause, he not only strove to prevent the diffusion of the Scriptures, and longed to strangle every attempt at their translation in the very *birth*, but even gloried in his enmity to all such proceedings." By a singular combination of circumstances, Cochlæus had been driven to take up his abode in Cologne, at the very time that Tyndale's printers were busy with their important work. He thus himself describes the manner in which he discovered what Tyndale was engaged in:—"Having become intimate and familiar with the Cologne printers, he sometimes heard them confidently boast, when in their cups, that whether the king and cardinal of England would or not, all England would in a short time be Lutheran. He heard also, that there were two Englishmen lurking here, learned, skilful in languages and fluent, whom, however, he could never see or converse with. Calling, therefore, certain printers into his lodging, after they were heated with wine, one of them, in more private discourse, discovered to him the secret by which England was to be drawn over to the side of Luther, viz., that three thousand copies of the Lutheran New Testament, translated into the English language, were in the press, and already were advanced as far as the tenth sheet; that the expenses were fully supplied by English merchants, who were secretly to convey the work, when printed, and dispose it widely through all England, before the King or Cardinal could discover or prohibit it. Cochlæus being inwardly affected by fear and wonder, disguised his grief under the appearance of admiration! But another day, considering with himself the magnitude of the grievous danger, he cast in mind by what method he might expeditiously obstruct these very wicked attempts. He went, therefore, secretly to Hermann Rinck, a patrician of Cologne, and military knight, familiar both with the emperor and the king of England, and a counsellor, and disclosed to him the whole affair as he had received it. He, that he might ascertain all things more certainly, sent another person into the house where the work was printing, and when he had ur-

derstood from him that the matter was even as Cochläus had reported it, and that there was great abundance of paper there, he went to the Senate, and so brought it about that the printer was interdicted from proceeding further in that work. The two English apostates, snatching away from them the quarto sheets printed, fled by ship going up the Rhine to Worms, where the people were under the full rage of Lutheranism, that there, by another printer, they might complete the work begun. Rinck and Cochläus, however, immediately advised, by their letters, the king, the cardinal, and the bishop of Rochester, that they might, with the greatest diligence, take care lest that most pernicious article of merchandise should be conveyed into all the ports of England." Cochläus used ever afterwards to regard his conduct in thus interrupting Tyndale's work as one of the most notable and praiseworthy exploits of his life. Again and again he afterwards made reference to it as a something to be greatly gloried in.

On arriving at Worms, Tyndale immediately began to print an octavo edition of his translation. The quarto edition had been discovered and described, and therefore he deemed it prudent to alter the size of the book, that it might not be so easily detected by his enemies. Both editions were, however, printed, and found their way into England and Scotland in 1526, the very next year after he had fled from Cologne. Of this octavo edition only one perfect copy is now known to exist. In the quarto edition there is a "Prologue," beginning with these words:—"To the People of England.—I have here translated, brethren and sisters, most dear and tenderly beloved in Christ, the New Testament, for your spiritual edifying, consolation, and solace: Exhorting instantly, and beseeching those that are better men in the languages than I, and that have higher gifts of grace to interpret the sense of the Scriptures, and meaning of the Spirit, than I, to consider and ponder my labour, and that with the spirit of meekness. And if they perceive, in any place, that I have not attained the very sense of the tongue or meaning of the Scriptures, or have not given the right English word, that they put to their hands to amend it, remembering that so is their duty to do. For we have not received the gifts of God for ourselves only, or for to hide them; but for to restore them for the honouring of God and Christ, and edifying of the congregation, which is the body of Christ."

Tyndale's New Testament first arrived in England in January 1526. This was the commencement of a new era in the history of Great Britain, the most important she has ever witnessed. The king, the cardinal (Wolsey), and the bishop

of Rochester, having been warned of what was to be expected, eagerly watched all the ports, so as to intercept the prohibited book. But notwithstanding all their efforts, the juncture was most favourable for the admission of that precious treasure into the kingdom. Simon Fysch, of Gray's Inn, London, and George Herman, a citizen of Antwerp, were among the most active in the work of importation. Before the end of January, the book had found its way into the possession of a few of the most learned young men in England, and was eagerly perused by them.

Simon Fysch had, through fear of Wolsey, been obliged to flee to the Continent. Here he became acquainted with Tyndale. In 1525, he composed and published a tract, called, "The Supplication of the Beggars." This tract was stealthily circulated in London. One day one of the king's footmen said to his majesty, that "if he would pardon him and such men as he would bring to his grace, he would see such a book as was a marvel to hear of." The king agreed to the proposal of his servant, who at the time appointed brought into the palace two merchants, George Eliot and George Robinson, that they might have a private audience with the king. They brought with them Fysch's tract, and read it to his majesty. It set forth very graphically all the enormities and rapacities of the monks and friars. The king listened with deep interest while they read. At length, after a pause, he said, "If a man should pull down an old stone wall, and begin at the lower part, the upper part thereof might chance to fall on his head." Then, taking the tract, he locked it up in his desk, commanding the men to say nothing of it. Wolsey, having discovered that that tract had been circulated in considerable numbers throughout the city, came to the king in great alarm, that he might put him on his guard against it. Whereupon the king, much to Wolsey's surprise, took the tract from his desk, and shewed it to him. Wolsey was fired with rage. He saw that something prompt must be done. Immediately he sent out orders for a "*secret search*." One Garret, a curate in London, fell under suspicion. The searchers found in his house many Lutheran tracts. The accusation that was laid against him contained the following charges:—"1. For bringing diverse and many books, treatises, and works of Martin Luther, and his sect; and also for dispersing abroad of said books to diverse and many persons within the realm, as well students in the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, as other spiritual, temporal, and religious men, to the intent to have advanced the said sect and opinions. 2. For having the said works in his custody; for reading them

secretly, in privy places and suspect company, declaring and teaching the lies and errors contained in them. 3. For that, in his own person, he followed, advanced, and set forth the said sect and opinions, and also moved, stirred, and counselled others to follow and advance the same, not only within the city and dioceses of London and Lincoln, but also in the universities of Oxford and Cambridge, with diverse other places. 4. That he *knew* certain religious persons which printed English books, or some that intended to print such books. 5. That he fled away, in a layman's apparel, from Oxford to Bedminster, when he should have been attached for heresy." In the beginning of February 1526, it was ascertained by the searchers, that Garret had gone to Oxford, with a great number of these books, in order to make sale of them to such as he knew to be lovers of the gospel. He had been in the habit of stealthily conveying books to both of the universities; among these books he now carried Tyndale's New Testament. On 7th February, Garret received notice, while at Oxford, that search was being made for him. He forthwith set out from the city, having somewhat changed his dress, so that he might the more easily escape observation. Delaber, who was one of the students at Oxford, thus describes the circumstances attending his departure:—"When he was gone down the stairs from my chamber, I straightway did shut my chamber door, and went into my study, and took the New Testament into my hands, kneeled down on my knees, and with many a deep sigh and salt tear I did, with much deliberation, read over the tenth chapter of the Gospel of Matthew; and when I had so done, with fervent prayer I did commit unto God that dearly beloved brother Garret, earnestly beseeching him, in and for Jesus Christ's sake, his only begotten Son, our Lord, that he would vouchsafe not only safely to conduct and keep our said dear brother from the hands of all his enemies, but also that he would endue his tender and lately born flock in Oxford with heavenly strength, by his Holy Spirit, that they might be able thereby valiantly to withstand to his glory all their fierce enemies, and also might quietly, to their own salvation, with all godly patience, bear Christ's heavy cross, which I now presently saw was to be laid on their young and weak backs; unable to bear so huge a burden without the great help of his Holy Spirit. This done, I laid aside my book safe." Garret was caught by his pursuers when he was only about two miles distant from the city, and he and all who were suspected were speedily cast into prison. Garret and Delaber were regarded as among the chief culprits. For a spectacle and a terror to others,

they were compelled to march at the head of a procession, composed of suspected persons, through the open streets, from St Mary's to Cardinal College, carrying in their hands a faggot. They were then cast into prison till farther orders. The other young men, who were supposed to favour the new learning, were all shut up in a deep cellar, under Cardinal College, which was the common repository of their salt fish. While confined in this noisome dungeon, four of their number died. The rest, after six months' imprisonment, were released, but were forbidden to leave Oxford. John Fryth, one of them, escaped, and fled to the Continent, to Tyndale, in September 1526. It was found by the searchers, that most of the students attending Cardinal College, Oxford, were infected with heresy.

If Oxford was thrown into a commotion by such proceedings, the excitement at Cambridge was still greater. At that university the Greek New Testament, published by Erasmus in 1516, was absolutely prohibited. It was not permitted to be brought within the walls. Not long after its publication, however, one of the students named Bilney, being in a state of great mental agitation, went to his priest for spiritual comfort. But there he could find no consolation. The priest had no message of joy to his wounded spirit. One day he heard some of his fellow-students speaking of a new book which contained wonderful things. It was Erasmus's New Testament. He was anxious to see it. But it was a prohibited book, and no one dared possess it but at the utmost peril. Still he hankered after it. Summoning up courage, he ventured out to a place where he understood he might obtain it. He procured a copy, and hiding it under his garment, he returned with it to his little chamber within the university, and having shut and locked his door, he took it out and with fear and trembling read. "At the first reading, as I well remember," says he, "I chanced upon this sentence of St Paul (O most sweet and comfortable sentence to my soul), 'It is a true saying, and worthy of all men to be embraced, that Jesus Christ came into the world to save sinners, of whom I am the chief and principal.' This one sentence, through God's instruction and inward teaching, which I did not then perceive, did so exhilarate my heart, before being wounded with the guilt of my sins, and being almost in despair, that immediately I felt a marvellous comfort and quietness, insomuch that my bruised bones leapt for joy." Again and again he read that marvellous verse (1 Tim. i. 15). It filled his whole soul with the joy of its tidings. "What," he exclaimed, "St Paul the chief of sinners, and yet St Paul sure of being saved. I am also

like Paul, and more than Paul, the greatest of sinners. But Christ saves sinners. At last I have heard of Jesus. Jesus Christ ; yes, Jesus Christ saves !—I see it all ; my vigils, my fasts, my pilgrimages, my purchase of masses and indulgences were destroying instead of saving me.” Bilney now became a devoted follower of the Lord Jesus Christ. He was the means of bringing to a saving knowledge of the truth as it is in Jesus, Hugh Latimer and Robert Barnes, men whose names afterwards became famous in the history of the Reformation in England.

Cambridge was also visited by the Cardinal’s “searchers.” The sergeant-at-arms was ordered “to make secret search for books, and instantly seize the whole, as well as apprehend all who possessed them.” No fewer than thirty were suspected. But Dr Forman of Queen’s College having given the students the hint that a secret search was about to be made, “all the books were conveyed away by the time the sergeant-at-arms, the Vice-Chancellor and Proctors, were at every man’s chamber.” Dr Barnes was seized on the ground of heresy, and conveyed to London. He was taken before Wolsey, who, as the result of his examination, gave forth his sentence that he must either *abjure* the heresies laid to his charge, or *be committed to the flames*. Barnes resolved rather to die than abjure his religion. But two of his friends, Fox and Gardner, “by persuasions that were mighty in the sight of reason and of foolish flesh,” prevailed on him to abjure and yield. To signalise the recantation of Barnes, and thereby to influence the public mind, “the Cardinal had a scaffold made on the top of the stairs of St Paul’s for himself, with six and thirty abbots, mitred priors and bishops, and he, in his whole pomp, mitred, which Barnes had denounced, sat there enthroned. His chaplain and spiritual doctors in gowns of damask and satin, and he himself in purple ! And there was a new pulpit erected on the top of the stairs for Fisher, the bishop of Rochester, to preach against Luther and Dr Barnes ; and great baskets full of books standing before them within the rails, which were commanded after the great fire was made before the large crucifix at the north gate of St Paul’s, there to be burned ; and these heretics after the sermon to go three times round the fire, and cast in their faggots.” There were condemned along with Barnes five others, German merchants, “for Luther’s books and Lollardy.” The foreign merchants in London lived for the most part in a place in Thames Street, which was called the Steel-yard, and on that account called in the history of the period “Steel-yard men.” This was the first occasion on which we read of books being committed

to the flames. Among others that were on that memorable eleventh of February 1526 cast into the fire, were copies of Tyndale's New Testament. Notwithstanding that after this Barnes was strictly watched, yet he found, privately, means of being useful in the circulation among the people of Tyndale's New Testament. After some time he escaped to the continent.

On the 20th March 1526, Henry issued a royal proclamation in which he says, "In the avoiding whereof (namely, pestilent heresies), we of our special tender zeal towards you, have with the deliberate advice of the most reverend father in God, Thomas Lord Cardinal Legate a latere, of the See Apostolic, Archbishop of York, primate and our chancellor of this realm, and other reverend fathers of the spirituality, determined the said and untrue translation to be burned, with farther sharp corrections and punishments against the keepers and readers of the same, reckoning of our wisdom that ye will well and thankfully perceive our tender and loving mind toward you therein, and that ye will never be greedy of any sweet wine, be grape never so pleasant, that ye will desire to taste it, being well advertised that your enemy before hath poisoned it."

During this summer Fysch, the author of the "Supplication, &c.," came over to England and took an active part in the circulation of Tyndale's New Testaments. He received them as they were sent over from Antwerp, and distributed them to men who, acting as do our modern colporteurs, carried them all over the country. In the eye of the priests, matters had now assumed a very grave aspect. Copies of the New Testament were found everywhere, and the bishops became alarmed. Tunstal, the bishop of London, issued an edict in the following terms:—"We have understanding by the report of divers credible persons, and also by the evident appearance of the matter, that many children of iniquity, maintainers of Luther's sect, blinded through extreme wickedness, wandering from the way of truth and the catholic faith, craftily have translated the New Testament into the English tongue, intermingling therewith many heretical articles and erroneous opinions, pernicious and offensive, seducing the simple people—of which translation there are many books imprinted containing in the English tongue that pestiferous and most pernicious poison dispersed throughout all our diocese in great number. . . . Wherefore, we Cuthbert, the bishop aforesaid, grievously sorrowing for the premises . . . do charge jointly and severally the archdeacons, and do warn and command you, that you warn or cause to be warned all and singular dwelling within your archdeaconries, that within

thirty days' space they do bring in and really deliver to our vicar general all and singular such books as contain a translation of the New Testament into the English tongue, and that you do certify to us within two months what you have done in the premises, under the pain of contempt. Given under our seal 24th October 1526." On the 3d of November the Archbishop of Canterbury issued a mandate in nearly the same terms. The search for New Testaments which was now begun continued for years. With unwearied zeal and earnestness the priests hunted everywhere for the proscribed book. By the end of this year (1526), many copies of the New Testament were committed to the flames.

The first two editions of Tyndale's translation were issued, as we have already seen, from the printing press of Worms. A third edition was issued from Antwerp, printed by one Christopher of Endhoven. Concerning this third edition several remarkable things occurred. The king and Wolsey had entered most eagerly into the spirit of the proclamation which had been published by Tunstal. But finding that copies of the obnoxious volume were by some means or other still finding their way into the country, they resolved to cut off supplies from abroad. While the burning of the book was constantly going on at home, the printing presses were always busy sending forth more copies. No stone must therefore be left unturned that they might find out the place where they were printed, in order that they might put a complete stop to the book. Wolsey resolved to send "searchers" into the suspected places abroad. At his instigation, Henry wrote two letters on the subject, one to Margaret the Lady Regent of the Low Countries, and another to the Governor of the English house of merchants at Antwerp. But the city of Antwerp was at that time the great commercial emporium of the world. Her merchants were princes. The lords of Antwerp were jealous of their liberties, and they refused to allow the printers to be interfered with. The council of the city did not seem disposed to give any assistance to Hackett, the agent for the Crown, to whom Wolsey had written on the subject. In a letter in which he gives Wolsey an account of the state of matters at this crisis, Hackett says:—"I certify your grace that I was so displeased with them of Antwerp, that I was purposed to have bought up all the foresaid books, and to have sent them to your grace, there to burn them and destroy them at home, like as all such malicious books meritably and worthily are to be done; but after that my anger had descended, and by counsel of a good friend of mine, I thought I was better to advise my lady and her council first, to know

and see what remedy they should do upon my complaint. And if their resolution like me not, that as then I would buy all the foresaid books, or as many as I could find, and send you them there, to do your Grace's pleasure, like as I will indeed if they do not have better justice." But the citizens of Antwerp were not to be priest-ridden, and for a season at least,

"Fair liberty, pursued and meant a prey
To lawless power, here turned and stood at bay."

Hackett, in his zeal to carry out the instructions of Wolsey, searched not only the town of Antwerp, but also Zealand, Ghent, Bruges, Brussels, Louvain, and other places. He gathered together as the fruit of his search, a large number of New Testaments, and had them publicly committed to the fire at Antwerp. This was not done, however, without awakening public indignation against such conduct as an unwarrantable stretch of power on the part of Hackett.

The year 1526 was fraught with the most momentous consequences to the future history of England. The book of God was laid open to the people, and was everywhere read with avidity. Despite all the efforts of the civil and ecclesiastical authorities, it went forth throughout the land as the mighty power of God. John Fryth, who had escaped from Oxford in September 1526, joined Tyndale at Worms, and made him acquainted with all that was going on in England. Notwithstanding the threatening aspect of the times, Tyndale prosecuted his labour with untiring and undaunted industry. He proceeded now with the translation of the Old Testament Scriptures, greatly assisted therein by his beloved companion Fryth.

In consequence of "the great rain that fell in the sowing time" of the year 1527, England was threatened with a famine. Bread advanced by the fall of the year to such a price that the people were in danger of starvation. Commissioners were sent out to ascertain what amount of grain still remained in the country. Wolsey was informed in behalf of the inhabitants of London, that "either the people must die from famine, or else they with strong hand will fetch corn from them that have it." In this crisis, "the merchants of the Steel-yard brought from Dantzic, Bremen, Hamburg, and other places great plenty; and so did other merchants from Flanders, Holland, and Friesland, so that wheat was abundant in London." Those ships that brought over the grain, also imported large quantities of Tyndale's New Testament. "After turning a fruitful land into barrenness, and the people were brought low through oppression, affliction, and sorrow, with bread-corn came the bread from

heaven. Through these very channels the sacred volume had come before, and now, notwithstanding all the rage and wrath in high places, it came again. He who appointed a way for his anger, was at the same moment preparing a way also for the reception of his word."

During 1528, Tunstal carried vigorously forward his search for Bibles and Bible readers. About a hundred persons in all were discovered in and about London, who were charged with the crime of reading the Bible, and were cast into prison. The confessions made by some of these prisoners are deeply interesting, and throw much light on the history of the times. One John Pykas confessed, "that about five years last past, at a certain time, his mother then dwelling at Bury sent for him, and moved him that he should not believe the sacraments of the church as that was not the right way. And then she delivered to him one book of Paul's Epistles in English MS., and bid him live after the manner and way of the said epistles and gospels, and not after the way the church doth teach. Also about two years last past (*i. e.*, about March 1526), he bought at Colchester of a Lombard of London, a New Testament in English, and paid for it four shillings (equal to about £3 of present currency), which New Testament he kept, and read it through many times." Robert Necton, confessed that "he bought at sundry times of Mr Fysch, dwelling by the Whitefriars in London, many of the New Testaments in English, *i. e.*, now five, now ten, and sometimes more, sometimes less, to the number of twenty or thirty—the which New Testaments Mr Fysch had of one Harman, an Englishman, lying beyond sea; that about the same time (1526), he sold five of the New Testaments to Sir William Furboshore in Suffolk, for seven or eight groats a piece, also two of the New Testaments in Bury St Edmonds for the same price; also that he sold to Sir Richard Bayfield, two New Testaments, unbound, about Christmas last, for which he paid three shillings four pence (equal to about £2, 10s.); that about Christmas last there came a Dutchman, now in Fleet Prison, which would have sold him 200 or 300 of the said New Testaments in English, which he did not buy, but sent them to Mr Fysch to buy them; that he had had the New Testament in his custody about a year and half after he knew it was condemned; that he had studied the same and read it through many times, and also has read it as well within the city and diocese of London, as within the city and diocese of Norwich, and not only read it himself, but read and taught it to many others."

Tunstal acted on the information he thus received, and

tried to get hold of Tyndale and Harman, and the others who were known to trade in Bibles. He wrote to Hackett, the English Ambassador at Antwerp, to try and seize them. Hackett succeeded in arresting Harman, who was cast into prison along with his wife. Harman was an extensive and influential merchant. He sent a petition to the Emperor representing his case. In that petition we find the following sentence:—“Richard Harman, being in prison for having sold New Testaments to English merchants, having been sent to him out of Germany, as also being accused of lodging in his house certain Lutherans, and for eating flesh on Sunday, does plead for himself petitioning the Emperor. He desires that he and his wife might be let out on sufficient bail, &c.” The imprisonment of Harman caused great excitement in Antwerp among the merchants, and aroused their indignation against all those who were concerned in bringing it about. After suffering seven months imprisonment, Harman and his wife were released. The English Ambassador was afterwards compelled to remove to Brussels, so hostile toward him was the public feeling now in Antwerp.

In spite of all his endeavours, Wolsey found that these New Testaments were still being imported into England. He therefore, in September 1528, sent over a friar to Frankfort to try and discover the publishers of the books. His agent purchased all the English books he could find at the great fair which was held in that city. In his letter to Wolsey, he informs him that he made liberal use of gifts and presents, and had bought up and stored away securely all the books. “But these books,” says he, “unless I had found them out and interposed, must have been bound in parchment and concealed and inclosed in packages artfully covered over with flax; they would in time, without any suspicion, have been transmitted by sea into Scotland and England.” It would thus seem that the Jews at Frankfort had a hand in the traffic in New Testaments. They had, no doubt, entered into the business as a simple commercial transaction. They were instrumental in opening new channels for the transmission of New Testaments into England.

Tyndale found it necessary for his personal safety to move about from place to place. He was greatly helped by Fryth in the work in which he was now engaged—the translation of the Old Testament. At this time Tunstal, More, and Hackett were sent over to the Low Countries to conclude a treaty with Lady Margaret, concerning “the continuation of traffic for merchants between the two countries, and the

forbidding to print or sell any Lutheran book on either side." The all-engrossing matter of Tyndale and the English Bible engaged the earnest attention of these ambassadors. It was proposed by Tunstall that the books should all be bought up and burned. More was opposed to this plan, alleging that it would help rather than hinder the cause. Tunstall, however, obstinately persisted in his determination to try the plan he had suggested. For this purpose he went himself to Antwerp, where he found one Packington, an English merchant, with whom he entered into an agreement about purchasing the books. Packington was very willing to further Tunstall's project. "My lord," said he, "if it be your pleasure I can, in this matter, do more I dare say than most of the merchants of England that are here, for I know the Dutchmen and strangers that have bought the books of Tyndale and have them here to sell; so that if it be your lordship's pleasure to pay for them, for otherwise I cannot come by them, I will then assure you to have every book of them that is imprinted and that is here unsold." The Bishop replied, "Gentle Mr Packington, do your diligence and get them, and with all my heart I will pay for them whatever they cost you, and I intend to destroy them all, and burn them at St Paul's cross." Packington now proceeded to carry out his commission. He came to Tyndale and said, "William, I know thou art a poor man, and hast a heap of New Testaments and books by thee, for which thou hast both endangered thy friends and beggared thyself, and I have now gotten thee a merchant which with ready money shall despatch thee of all that thou hast, if you think it profitable for yourself." "Who is the merchant?" asked Tyndale. "The Bishop of London," said Packington. "Oh, that is because he will burn them," Tyndale replied. "Yes," quoth Packington. "I am gladder," said Tyndale; "for these two benefits shall come thereof—I shall get money to bring myself out of debt, and the whole world will cry out against the burning of God's word—and the surplus of the money that shall remain to me shall make me more studious to correct the New Testament, and so newly to imprint the same once again, and I trust the second will much better please you than the first." Then the bargain was concluded. "The Bishop had the books, Packington had the thanks, and Tyndale had the money!" "After this," says Foxe, "Tyndale corrected the same New Testament again, and caused them to be new imprinted, so that they came thick and three-fold into England."

Wolsey was now no longer the king's favourite. He had fallen into disgrace. Sir Thomas More became his suc-

cessor as lord chancellor. The Parliament assembled (1529) for the first time since 1523. The members of the House of Commons shewed a disposition to restrain the priests, and put a check to their rapacity and their arrogance. With reference to their proceedings, Foster, the Bishop of Rochester, said in the House of Lords, "My lords, you see daily what bills come hither from the Commons' House, and all is to the destruction of the Church. See what a realm the kingdom of Bohemia was, and when the Church went down, then fell the glory of the kingdom. Now with the Commons it is nothing but 'Down with the Church.'" The ecclesiastical dignitaries became alarmed at the spirit they saw growing up. They were aroused to more rigorous efforts against heretics. More and Tunstal drew up and issued a proclamation, enjoining, "That no man within the king's realm hereafter presume to preach, teach, or inform anything openly or privily, compile and write any book, or keep any school, contrary to the determination of Holy Church. That all persons having such books or writings deliver them up within fifteen days. That no person is henceforth to bring into this realm, or to sell, receive, take, or detain any book or work printed or written against the faith Catholic." A list of the prohibited books is appended to the proclamation, at the head of which stands Tyndale's New Testament. All who offended against that proclamation were to be condemned to death by fire. This is a new era in the history of persecution in England. It was the first *royal* proclamation of the kind. Wolsey, with all his ambition, had never ventured to go the length of persuading his majesty thus publicly to identify himself with the actions of the Church against heretics.

In the month of May, the cargo of Bibles which Packington had purchased in Antwerp were delivered to the Bishop. According to his declared intention, he made a great bonfire of them at St Paul's church-yard. "This burning," says Burnet the historian, "had such a hateful appearance in it, being generally called a burning of the word of God, that people from thence concluded there must be a visible contrariety between that book and the doctrines of those who handled it; by which both their prejudice against the clergy, and their desire of reading the New Testament, was increased." The Bishop of London then wholly failed in his endeavour to cut off the supplies. Hearing that New Testaments were, notwithstanding all he had done, still coming "thick and three-fold into England," he sent for Packington and said to him, "Sir, how cometh this, that there are so many New Testaments abroad and you promised and assured

me that you had bought them *all*?" Packington replied, "I promised you I bought *all* that *then* was to be had, but I perceive they have made more *since*, and it will never be better as long as they have the letters and stamps. Therefore it were better for your lordship to buy the stamps too, and *then* you are sure." The Bishop smiled at this suggestion and said, "Well, Mr Packington, well!" He had a very different project now in his head. Since the burning of the books had failed, they must now burn the *men*.

Henry became more and more ferocious in his character, and seemed to take pleasure in seconding to the utmost the persecuting efforts of the priests to suppress the circulation of the Bible. The translator, Tyndale, was the chief object of enmity, but a gracious Providence watched over him amid the manifold perils that encompassed him till his great work was done. In 1530, Margaret, the Regent of the Low Countries, died. Charles appointed his sister Mary, queen of Hungary, as her successor. The civil and ecclesiastical authorities took advantage of this to renew their search for Tyndale, having sent over a special embassy to the Low Countries for that purpose. The ambassador reported that he had failed to discover Tyndale. "It is unlikely," he said, "to get Tyndale into England, when he daily heareth so many things from thence which feareth him—would God he were in England." He afterwards reported to Tunstal that he had succeeded in obtaining an interview with Tyndale in a field outside the city of Antwerp. He tried to persuade him to go to England. "But," says he, "he answered that he neither would nor durst come into England, albeit your grace would promise him never so much security." Tyndale still went on with his work of translating the Scriptures. The persecution against the readers of the Bible increased in virulence all over England. Many who were found to be implicated in the work of circulating the New Testament were put to death. Many were the sad scenes of martyrdom that were witnessed in those days. One of the martyrs, Bainham, son of Sir Alexander Bainham, a knight of Gloucestershire, when brought to the stake made the following address to the assembled crowd:—"I come hither, good people, accused and condemned for an heretic, Sir Thomas More being my accuser and my judge, and these be the articles that I die for, which be very truth, and grounded on God's word, and no heresy. They be these: *first*, I say it is lawful for every man and woman to have God's book in their mother tongue. The *second* article is, That the Bishop of Rome is Antichrist, and that I know no other keys of heaven's gates but only the preaching of the

law and the gospel, and that there is no other purgatory but the purgatory of Christ's blood, and the purgatory of the cross which is all persecution and affliction." Yet the king and More would not be contented till they had the arch-heretic Tyndale himself in their grasp. Their search for him was continued with renewed rigour.

In 1532 Fryth came over to England. He was one of the students who had fled from Oxford in 1526 and joined Tyndale on the continent. On his arrival in London he was seized and imprisoned in the Tower. Tyndale having heard of this, wrote him in the following words: "Dearly beloved, however the matter may be, commit yourself only and wholly unto your most loving Father, and fear not men that threat, nor trust men that speak fair, but trust him that is true of promise and able to make his word good. Your cause is Christ's Gospel, a light that must be fed by the blood of faith. The lamp must be dressed daily, and that oil poured in every evening and morning, that the light go not out. Though we be sinners, yet is the cause right. Dearly beloved, be of good courage. If you give yourself, cast yourself, commit yourself, wholly and only to your loving Father then shall his power be in you and make you strong, so strong that you shall feel no pain. . . . The God of peace, of hope, and of faith be with you. Amen." On 20th June 1538, Fryth was condemned after trial before the Bishop. He was sent to Newgate. There, laden with irons, as many as he could bear, and his neck made fast to a post with a collar of iron, he could neither stand upright nor sit down. On 4th July he was burned at Smithfield along with others.

After Fryth's death Tyndale felt himself very lonely, yet he continued with vigour to prosecute his great life's work. Along with constant issues from different presses in Antwerp of the New Testament, there was now also (1534) printed an edition of the Pentateuch in English. A new spirit was growing up in England. The past ten years had been years of great change. The new learning had found many advocates. The light was dawning which was soon to shine in splendour over England. It will be remembered that Richard Herman and his wife had been imprisoned in Antwerp, through the influence of Hackett, because they were found to be helpers of Tyndale. Now five years after they had been imprisoned, they came over to London to seek redress. They made direct application to the Queen, Anne Boleyn. She wrote to Cromwell, the chief secretary of State, and sent Herman as bearer of the letter, which was in the following terms:—"Whereas we be credibly informed that the

bearer hereof, Richard Herman, merchant and citizen of Antwerp in Brabant, was in the time of the late lord cardinal, put and expelled from his freedom and fellowship, of and in the English house there, for nothing else (as he affirmeth) but only for that he, still like a good Christian man, did both with his goods and policy, to his great hurt and hindrance in this world, help to the setting forth of the New Testament in English: we therefore desire and instantly pray you, that with all speed and favour convenient, ye will cause this good and honest merchant, being my lord's true, faithful, and loving subject, to be restored to his pristine freedom, liberty, and fellowship, aforesaid, and the sooner at this our request, and at your good leisure to hear him in such things as he hath to make further relation unto you in this behalf. Given under our signet, at my lord's manor of Greenwich, the 13th day of May." What a contrast between this language of the Queen of England and that of the Bishop of London's proclamation in 1526, where he speaks of "the crafty translation of the New Testament in the English tongue, containing that pestiferous and most pernicious poison, dispersed throughout all our diocese of London in great numbers"! This was the Lord's doing. A mighty work is now going forward in England by unseen agency. There is now in the British Museum a copy of the New Testament, printed on vellum and elegantly bound in blue morocco, which Tyndale printed for the queen after he had heard of the above incident regarding Herman. The storm of persecution had for the moment abated. The word of God seems to have "free course." No one is molested for selling or buying, for possessing or reading it. The convocation which met in the end of this year takes up the matter, and, probably mainly through the influence of Cranmer, goes the length of even requesting his majesty to decree, "That the Scriptures should be translated into the vulgar tongue by some honest and learned men, to be nominated by the king, and to be delivered to the people according to their learning."

The progress of the "new learning" alarmed the old party that had hitherto held sway in England. They felt that something must be done by them to recover their influence, else it would soon pass from them for ever. Their attention is again directed to Tyndale, and it was thought that if he could be arrested and put to death, the work of which he was the instigator, and in which he was the chief actor, would be easily arrested. They had tried the plan of buying up and burning the Book, but it had failed. Now they must burn the translator himself.

Tyndale was at this time (1535) residing in the house of Thomas Poynty, an English merchant in Antwerp. A plot was formed for the purpose of apprehending him. One Henry Phillips was sent over by the bishops charged with the carrying out of the plot. He at length succeeded, and had Tyndale committed as a prisoner to the castle of Vilvorde, about twenty-three English miles from Antwerp. The divided state of opinion among the English merchants at Antwerp, and the variance between the king of England and Charles, favoured the efforts of Tyndale's enemies. The fact of Tyndale's imprisonment was now well known in England, Scotland, and Germany. Efforts were in various ways made in his behalf, but they were always frustrated. Dark and troublous times had come. The friends of the "old learning" for the time triumphed. At length, after enduring imprisonment at Vilvorde for more than a year and a half, Tyndale was, on 6th October 1536, led forth to be put to death. As he was being fastened to the stake, he cried out with a loud voice, "LORD! OPEN THE EYES OF THE KING OF ENGLAND." He was first strangled, and then his body was consumed to ashes. Thus perished one of England's noblest martyrs. His labour was not in vain. His memory is blessed.

Good old John Foxe thus writes regarding him, in summing up his estimate of his character:—"First, he was a man very frugal and spare of body, a great student and earnest labourer in the uttering forth of the Scriptures of God. He reserved or hallowed to himself two days in the week, which he named his pastime, Monday and Saturday. On Monday he visited all such poor men and women as were fled out of England, by reason of *persecution*, into Antwerp, and these, once well understanding their good exercises and qualities, he did very liberally comfort and relieve, and in like manner provided for the sick and diseased persons. On the Saturday he walked round about the town, seeking every corner and hole where he suspected any poor person to dwell; and when he found any well occupied, but over-burdened with children, or else were aged and weak, these also he plentifully relieved. And thus he spent his two days of pastime, as he called them. And truly his alms were very large, and so they might well be, for his exhibition that he had yearly of the English merchants at Antwerp, when living there, was considerable, and that for the most part he bestowed upon the poor. The rest of the days of the week he gave wholly to his *book*, wherein he most diligently travailed. When Sunday came,

then went he to some one merchant's chamber or other, whither came many other merchants, and unto them would he read some one parcel of Scripture, the which proceeded so fruitfully, sweetly, and gently from him, much like to the writing of John the Evangelist, that it was a heavenly comfort and joy to his audience to hear him read the Scriptures; likewise after dinner he spent an hour in the same manner. He was a man without any spot or blemish, of rancour or malice, full of mercy and compassion, so that no man living was able to reprove him by any sin or crime, although his righteousness and justification depended not thereupon before God, but only upon the blood of Christ, and his faith upon the same. In this faith he died with constancy at Vilvorde, and now resteth with the glorious company of Christ's martyrs, blessed in the Lord. And thus much of the life and story of the true servant and martyr of God, WILLIAM TYNDALE, who, for his notable pains and travail, may well be called the Apostle of England in this our latter age."

ART. VI.—*Rationalism not allied to Protestantism.*

History of Rationalism: embracing a survey of the present state of Protestant Theology. By JOHN F. HURST, D.D. Revised and Enlarged from the Third American Edition. London: Trübner & Co. 1867.

THE tendency of thought in the present day on almost all subjects has a decidedly historical character. Men are more inclined to inquire what has been thought, than what ought to be thought on any given topic; and to form their judgment of the truth or falsehood of any opinion or system, rather from a consideration of its origin, history, and tendency, than from an examination of the direct evidence for or against its reception. It is a striking evidence and illustration of this tendency, that even a phenomenon of so recent appearance in the sphere of theology as Rationalism has already found so many historians. The number of works bearing more or less on the history of this form of opinion is very considerable; and besides those which are more special in their purpose and partial in their extent, there have been several attempts to give a complete and regular history of Rationalism both by its friends and its opponents. In Germany, Kahnis has written this history from the high Lutheran point of view; Schwarz has nar-

rated it with the sympathy of a follower; and Hagenbach has traced it in a moderate and impartial but evangelical spirit: in England we have Farrar's Bampton Lectures, and Lecky's admiring and enthusiastic description of the rise and progress of the spirit of Rationalism in Europe: so that the controversy might seem to be carried on as much on the field of history as on that of reason, for though many of the works we refer to are not avowedly or really controversial, yet they are written with a view of bringing out more or less fully the causes of the rise and progress of the opinions described, and cannot but take a different colouring according to the opinions of the authors. The volume before us is a contribution to this branch of literature from the other side of the Atlantic, and it occupies a very respectable place among the other works of the same class. We do not think indeed that it is likely to be a work of permanent and classical value to future ages; the author probably did not aspire, like Thucydides, to make his work a *κρῆμα ἐς αἰετὶς*: but there is hardly any of the works on this subject of which this can be said; and perhaps the time has not yet come when the course of Rationalism can be looked back upon from a sufficient distance or height, that a thoroughly complete and satisfactory history of it can be written. But though falling short of so high a standard, by which it would perhaps not be fair to try him, Dr Hurst has succeeded very fairly in producing a work which will be very useful for the present time, to all who wish within brief compass and in a clear and interesting narrative to obtain some idea of the antecedents and present condition throughout Christendom of that Rationalistic school of thought which is so prominent and powerful in the present day. Even considered from this lower point of view, the undertaking was no easy one. The field is vast and varied, embracing Germany, Holland, France, Switzerland, Britain, and America; the period is long, extending in some degree of fulness from the Reformation, and in full detail from the middle of last century down to the present day; and this immense area and extensive time has to be filled with the events and changes in the world of mind and opinion, which are ever more difficult to catch and to depict than those that take place on the stage of external history. Of this wide field our author has given us an exceedingly careful and painstaking, and on the whole accurate sketch. We may sometime have occasion to give him the benefit (to which he is surely justly entitled), of the Horatian maxim, "*Verum opere in longo fas est obrepere somnum*;" but for the most part we can trust the correctness and fairness of his statement of facts. We also admire very

much the spirit in which the book is written. It is pervaded by a devout and evangelical tone, Dr Hurst ever manifesting a hearty sympathy with what is true and good ; and, at the same time, his language is entirely free from bitterness or vituperation, in speaking, as he has so frequent occasion to do, of what he cannot but regard as errors of the most radical and destructive nature. His intention is uniformly candid and fair, and his language temperate and inoffensive. His style is easy, plain, and perspicuous ; though it is far from being elegant or striking, or even always correct, it carries the reader along in an equable and pleasant flow of narrative. Occasionally, however, the work betrays its transatlantic origin by Americanisms, which grate harshly on the ear of an English reader.

But with all his good intentions and painstaking performance, we must say that our author greatly disappoints our expectation. He fails entirely to give anything like a clear and intelligible account of the rise and development of Rationalism, as a system of opinions or mode of thinking in the Protestant churches. He notices indeed in due course nearly all the leading men that have held and promoted such views, and gives accounts more or less full and satisfactory of their opinions ; but after all we only see in his narrative a disconnected series of individual phenomena following one upon the other ; of the causes that produced these phenomena, and the connection that linked one to another, we get no distinct idea from his narrative, as he either avoids attempting such explanations at all, or where he does, his attempts are of the most weak and unsatisfactory kind. Indeed, the title of his book is really a misnomer. Had it been called the history of the decline and revival of evangelical religion in the Protestant Churches, it would have more accurately described what Dr Hurst has really given us. He has introduced a good deal that would have been very suitable had that been his avowed subject, but which has only a very indirect and remote bearing on the history of Rationalism ; as, for instance, the notices of the philanthropic labours of the evangelical school in Germany, which occupy a whole chapter in his work, but which surely might have been sufficiently disposed of, in so far as they bear on the history of Rationalism, by a much briefer notice. And on the other hand he has passed over entirely, or with very slight notice, some subjects which, in a history of Rationalism proper, should have occupied a very important place. Thus we do not find in this work any adequate account of the English Deists and their opinions, nor any notice of the rise of the modern science of criticism, which

really did attain results that have been universally accepted, and have led to some change in the mode of evangelical statements, but which was pushed to so great an excess by the rationalistic school. A fair recognition and estimate of the labours and successes of the eminent scholars and critics of the last and present centuries should surely have found a place in a history of Rationalism. The truth is, that of Rationalism as a principle, the work does not give us any history at all; it gives, no doubt, a description of most of the results of Rationalism; the special opinions or doubts in which the principle successively embodied itself, in its most distinguished and influential adherents; but it shews no grasp at all of the principles that underlay these particular opinions, and of which they are but the expressions.

The perpetual dealing with results, instead of seeking to penetrate to the principles that lay beneath them, gives to Dr Hurst's book, what it would have been specially desirable in such a work to have avoided, a certain air of dogmatism, which must prove offensive to many readers. As he invariably occupies the stand-point of orthodoxy himself, his mode of judging of all opinions by their results, as approaching to or diverging from that which he regards as truth, causes his discussion not unfrequently to suggest the idea, that he sets up an arbitrary standard of soundness in the faith, and without regard to reason or argument, summarily condemns whatever falls short of that standard, simply because it does so. No doubt, in a historical sketch of so large a field, it would have been impossible to have entered into the proofs of his opinions at every step; nor could it have been expected on the other hand, that he should have concealed or disguised his own convictions; but had he been able to seize the various classes of opinion in their root principles, instead of merely describing them in their application as worked out in detail, he might in the very process of narrating have given his readers such an insight into the grounds and reasons of either side, as would have enabled him to express his own convictions as freely and strongly as he pleased, without the offensive appearance of resting them simply on the *ipse dixit* of any church or creed. It is only an appearance of dogmatism, we believe, after all; and it is one that necessarily resulted from the superficial mode in which he treats the subject; but it is not the less to be regretted, as it makes the book a very unfit one to make a favourable impression on any who may have a leaning towards Rationalism. Such a one would be apt to jump to the conclusion, that the author is a mere partizan, coming forward with foregone conclusions, measuring everything by their

standard; that he is, in a word, an unfair and partial historian. Now we do not think he is really unfair, at least consciously so; we see in him a conscientious effort to deal even-handed justice to all; but to this extent certainly he fails to do justice to many of those from whom he differs, that he is from the turn of his mind entirely unable to enter into and sympathise with their views of things and mode of thinking. Now no man who cannot do that, will ever give a statement of any opinions that will appear fair and satisfactory to an adherent of them. It is one thing to be able to give a perfectly correct and fair statement of the opinions of an adversary; and the clear-headedness and candour needed for this are not so common as to permit us to despise this faculty; but to write a really great history of doctrines, there is needed over and above this, the power of which some minds seem entirely destitute, of putting themselves in the position of others, so as not only to understand what they held, but to see how it was that such things appeared true to them. Now, with all his willingness to do them justice, Dr Hurst has not in him the least of the spirit that animated the Rationalists, whose history he writes, or the least sympathy with it. He is entirely destitute of the philosophical turn of mind. Now it is just that turn of mind, in many cases excessive, and in all misguided, that animated the leaders of Rationalism; and while perhaps the absence of such a turn for speculation and inquiry may be a safeguard against the allurements and assaults of Rationalism, it is certainly a very bad equipment for confuting and overcoming it. The want of this spirit shews itself throughout the volume, it is the greatest of its defects, and the cause of nearly all its faults. Take for instance the chapter in which he sets himself to give a summary of the Rationalistic opinions at the time of their highest culmination. Here, if anywhere, we should expect to find at least a distinct orderly arrangement, if not one founded on some general and radical principle. But instead of that, we have a mere chaos of subjects and doctrines, without a guiding principle or intelligible arrangement. He gives us the opinions of the Rationalists on the following subjects in the following order:—Religion, the Existence of God, Inspiration, the Credibility of Scripture, the Fall of Man, Miracles, Prophecy, the Person of Christ; and after some notices under each of these heads, many of them as crude and ill digested as the general arrangement itself, he proceeds:—"From what we have now said, the opinions of the Rationalists on all points of Christian doctrines become apparent" (P. 178). With all deference to our author, to us at least, from anything he has said, the opinions of the

Rationalists do not become apparent on any one point of Christian doctrine, save that of the authority of Scripture. The same utter want of order and system is observable, on a smaller scale, as often as Dr Hurst attempts to give a statement of the opinions of any man or school; we are presented with a congeries of opinions on all sorts of subjects, of great and of little importance, huddled together without plan or method; and we are left at the end without any clear idea of what were the leading principles of the theory in question.

It was impossible, in a history of Rationalism, to avoid giving a somewhat prominent place to the philosophical systems and theories of the seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth centuries, which have in succession exercised so commanding an influence on the theology of the church. This must have proved a rather trying task to an author to whom such speculations are so little congenial, and, as might have been expected, though he manifests no hesitation or lack of confidence in his own judgment in attempting it, the portions where he touches upon philosophy are decidedly the weakest parts of his book. He passes in the first instance a very sweeping condemnation on the whole body of modern philosophy. He regards it as a sort of Protestantism in the schools, a revolt against the old traditional systems of philosophy, parallel to that of Luther and his fellow-reformers against the theology of Rome. Only, he alleges, there was a fundamental difference between the two, since "Religious Protestantism had its origin in faith, and was based on the Scriptures, while philosophical Protestantism had its origin in doubt, and in the absolute repudiation of the Scriptures as a rule of faith" (p. 80). Now, this antithesis, however pointed, seems to us to be very ambiguous, and, according as we take it, either unmeaning or unfair. Does Dr Hurst really imagine that philosophy can ever be based upon Scripture in the same sense in which theology ought to be? Does he not know that it must, from its very nature, be founded upon independent principles, whether intuitions of reason or facts of observation; that it must, in the first instance, ignore the teachings of revelation; and that all that can be expected from the most sound philosophy is, that it shall not contradict, but, if it may be, confirm the doctrines of Scripture? If this is all he means by the contrast between philosophical and religious Protestantism, it is utterly unmeaning, and involves no censure upon the former at all. If, on the other hand, his real meaning be, as we imagine it is, that the philosophy of the seventeenth and following centuries, not only pursued its

course independently of Scripture, but positively repudiated and subverted it, this is doubtless a very grave charge; but it is one which it is utterly unfair to make in such a sweeping way against modern philosophy as a whole. It does apply, it is true ("and pity 'tis, 'tis true"), to some philosophers and schools of philosophy that have been, and are, very eminent and influential; but no well informed and candid man can say that it lies against modern philosophy as a whole. Does it apply, for example, to the inductive science of Bacon, the psychology of the Scottish school, the ethical teaching of Butler, or the religious philosophy of Jonathan Edwards? And though perhaps, from an evangelical stand-point, and with a view to their influence upon the growth of Rationalism in theology, the systems of Des Cartes, Leibnitz, and Kant may be justly open to some degree of censure; there is no sort of justice or propriety in involving them in an indiscriminating condemnation along with Spinoza, Hegel, and Schelling. Yet this is what Dr Hurst does. Des Cartes' philosophy he stigmatises as sceptical, on the ground that he started from universal doubt; but, as this was only his point of departure, from which he built up a system by logical demonstration, his philosophy was, in reality, much more dogmatical than sceptical in its spirit and tendency, and very different in these respects from real scepticism, such as that of Hume. The philosophy of Leibnitz, which gained such vast influence in Germany, under the popularised form given it by Wolff, is likewise very harshly judged by our author; but though it did tend in its day to promote greatly the growth of Rationalism, we do not think that this was owing to any defects or anti-evangelical principles essentially belonging to it as a philosophy, but rather to its having had too high a place given to it, as excluding or superseding the teachings of Christianity. The same remark may be made of the philosophy of Kant, which is also too harshly judged by our author, but which was in reality a reaction and protest against the empiricism of the sensationalists and the scepticism of Hume, and in favour of the essential first principles that lie at the base of all sound philosophy; though, by giving these too exclusively a subjective character, as necessary forms of thought, and not intuitions of objective realities, as the Scottish philosophers maintained them to be, the philosopher of Königsberg left open a door by which idealism and pantheism again entered in the speculations of Fichte, Schelling, and Hegel. The following sentences from the *History of Christian Doctrine*, by Dr Hurst's compatriot, Dr Shedd, give a much clearer as well as sounder and more discriminating view of the

bearing of modern philosophy on religious truth than all the long dissertations in the work before us.

“ The Germanic mind has been influenced during the last hundred years by two entirely antagonistic systems of human speculation,—that of Theism and that of Pantheism. The former, as we have seen, has come down from Plato and Aristotle; the latter, though not unknown to the ancient world, yet received its first scientific construction in the mind of that original and powerful errorist, Baruch Spinoza. The revival of the interest in philosophy, which began as soon as the general European mind had become somewhat tranquilised after the deep central excitement of the Reformation, and of the theological controversies that followed it, had partially abated, shewed itself in the rise of the systems of Des Cartes, Leibnitz, Wolff, and Kant. All these systems are substantially theistic. They reject the doctrine of only one substance, and strongly mark the distinction between finite and infinite Being. They are all of them, in greater or less degrees, influenced by the systems of Plato and Aristotle, and are in the same general line of philosophical speculation. But the deep and solid foundation for Pantheism that had been laid by Spinoza, and the imposing architectural superstructure which he himself had reared upon it, gave origin to another and totally different philosophical tendency and system of speculation. For, although Des Cartes, Leibnitz, and Kant differ from each other, and upon important points, yet their systems are all theistic, and therefore favourable to the principles of ethics and natural religion. The systems of Spinoza and his successors Schelling and Hegel have, on the other hand, a more uniform agreement with each other. They are fundamentally and scientifically pantheistic, and therefore are destructive of the first principles of morals and religion. By their doctrine of only one substance, only one intelligence, only one being, they annihilate all the fixed lines and distinctions of theism,—distinctions like those which imply the *metaphysical* reality of an uncreated and a created essence or being, and lines like those which distinguish right and wrong, free-will and fate, from each other as *absolute* contraries, *irreconcilable* opposites. So far, therefore, as the theological mind of Germany has been influenced by the earlier Germanic philosophy, and more especially so far as it has felt the influence of the Platonic and Aristotelian systems themselves, it has adopted the historical theism, and its philosophical thinking has harmonised with that of the church from the beginning. It is true that in the seventeenth century the German Church was largely infected with Rationalism and Deism, but this should be traced primarily to a decline of the religious life itself,—to the absence of a profound consciousness of sin and redemption. The existence of a living and practical experience of New Testament Christianity in the heart does not depend ultimately upon a system of philosophy good or bad, though it is undoubtedly favoured or hindered by it, but upon far deeper and more practical causes.”—(*Shedd's History of Christian Doctrine*, vol. i. pp. 95–97.)

These are sound and valuable views, yet so far is Dr.

Hurst from sharing them, that while he judges so severely, as we have seen, the comparatively sound philosophy of the eighteenth century, he actually eulogises Schelling and Hegel, the very leaders of the Pantheistic school, as having given a better direction and speculation than it had taken before; and only takes leave of them with a few mild remarks on the vanity of all philosophy, because, forsooth, its disciples have thought independently of the Bible (pp. 137-9). Nor is he more happy in his remarks on the philosophy of France (pp. 314, 315). The unfortunate Des Cartes is again pilloried as "the apostle of Rationalism in France;" but no notice whatever is taken of the sensationalistic philosophy of the Encyclopedists; and Positivism is actually characterised as "a subordinate system," and one that "is every year losing its hold on the land of its birth." Happy indeed should we be to believe that, as we consider that system to be the greatest and most formidable modern enemy to the truth in the province of philosophy; but we are greatly afraid our author is much too sanguine in this particular. We need not follow Dr Hurst further in this line. We need not review his still more meagre notice of English philosophy, or advert to the singular misapprehension with which he stigmatises Coleridge's famous distinction between reason and understanding as a concession to Rationalism; enough has come out to shew his utter inaptitude to sympathise with or even to comprehend the processes and results of philosophic thought.

The same mental tendency that leads Dr Hurst to disparage and misunderstand the inquiries of philosophy, also betrays him at times into very gross unfairness to systematic theology. This appears very early in his work. He traces, and justly, the rise of Rationalism to some causes that were in operation very soon after the Reformation, and among these he mentions the many and bitter controversies among the Protestants. But he makes a very unfounded statement when he goes on to allege (p. 29) that "it is to the numerous confessions of faith that we must attribute most of these controversies." He enumerates a number of these confessions, though, by the way, only the Lutheran ones, and then remarks that "amid this mass of doctrinal opinion, in which many conflicting points were easy enough to find, it was no small task to know what to accept." But is he not aware that on all the leading heads of theology the Protestant confessions, not only Lutheran but Reformed, are entirely at one? Further, when he says that "the very names of the controversies of that day indicate the real littleness of many of the points in question;" and then pro-

ceeds to enumerate, among others, the Antinomian, the Synergistic, and the Osiandrian controversies; we can only wonder what his idea of a great point in theology is. We are quite willing to allow that there is some degree of truth in the censure he passes on the theologians of that day, but it is certainly pronounced in far too sweeping and reckless a way. In subsequent parts of his book Dr Hurst indulges in what we must call very silly and vulgar sneers at the voluminousness of the old theological works, and the minute scholastic distinctions, and prolix discussions in which they abound. No doubt the form of many of the systematic treatises of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries is singularly unfortunate and repulsive to modern taste; but surely a historian of Rationalism has too much to censure and deplore to spend much time on such faults of manner, and he should at least have recognised the permanent value of many of these uncouth and unwieldy tomes as storehouses of learning and argument for the exposition and defence of the truth. But it is to the Dutch theology and church that Dr Hurst, in his horror of scholasticism, does most grievous injustice; and indeed the chapter in which he describes the theology and religion of Holland, from the Synod of Dort to the commencement of the present century, almost requires us to make an exception to the praise we gave to the book in general, as manifesting a reverent and evangelical spirit. It appears to us that the tone in which he speaks in that chapter is very unbecoming, especially the way in which he sneers at the theological discussions and experimental preaching of the divines, and the religious knowledge of the people. And we hold that no man, whatever his own views may be, has a right to say as Dr Hurst does (p. 270), "The doctrines of grace, of which the Church of Holland had always been the defenders, left no room for an ethical system;" or to characterise the practical teaching of the Dutch divines as "a disgusting system of casuistic ethics" (p. 271).

There is indeed, we are ready to allow, some foundation in fact for the remarks of our author, both upon the philosophy and the scholastic theology of the post-Reformation period, as having had an injurious effect on religion, but these topics would need to be handled with a far more discriminating and delicate touch than Dr Hurst brings to them. The minute exactness, the elaborate distinctions, and pedantic forms of the theological treatises of that age did tend to divorce and alienate theology from spiritual life, and to give it a hard, dry, and repulsive aspect, and so to bring about a reaction against orthodoxy: and the philosophy of the day was by many raised to too high a position, as if it

might supersede the special teachings of revelation entirely. But at the most we can only say that the defects or faults of the prevalent philosophy and theology were the occasions, not the real causes, of the rise of Rationalism. Its cause must be sought in something deeper than either, in the decay of real godliness and spiritual life in the church, and when that was most marked the rise and progress of Rationalism was most rapid and formidable. This leads us, instead of pursuing further our criticism of this particular work, to enter upon some general train of thought, suggested by the subject itself, which it brings before us.

The most important and interesting question raised by a survey of the history of Rationalism is that concerning its relation to the principles of the Reformation : Is it, or is it not, a legitimate development of Protestant principles ? Is its fundamental axiom identical with, or a logical consequence of, that which alone justified the Reformers in their revolt against the authority of Rome ? Or is there an essential difference and opposition between them ? This is a question that can hardly be avoided in the present day, and which the defenders of evangelical truth must fairly face and answer. It is pressed upon them from both sides. On the one hand, the advocates of Rationalism claim to be regarded as following in the footsteps of the Reformers, asserting the liberty of thought and right of private judgment, which they first proclaimed, and repudiating the usurpation of outward authority in the shape it now assumes, as they repudiated it when claimed by the Pope or the Church. If they have arrived at results widely different from the views of the first Protestants, it is only because they have carried out their principles in a more consistent and thorough-going manner ; and if Protestants refuse to acquiesce in their opinions, and censure them for undue licence, they are really inconsistent with their professed principles, and so far conceding to a spiritual despotism, and retreating to the Romish position. Such are the views of the so-called Liberal school of the present day. And, on the other hand, these views are acquiesced in and eagerly laid hold of by the adherents of the Church of Rome. They point to Rationalism as the legitimate outgrowth of Protestantism ; and assure us, that once the certain guidance of authority is given up, there is no safeguard left against falling a prey to the endless doubts and thousand and one errors in which the human mind has lost itself. The Reformers, it is true, and those who still attempt to stand in their position, did not go so far as that ; but they set their foot upon the treacherous slope, and, though they might sustain themselves for a time, their position is pre-

carious and uncertain, and the only way to be absolutely safe from gliding down at last to the abyss of doubt, is to regain their footing on the sure ground of authority. Thus both of the opposing parties seem determined to reduce the question to a simple alternative between Rome and reason, between the absolute authority of the church, and the arbitrary allegations of the schools, and meanwhile to unite their forces from opposite sides, in driving out of the way the Biblical Christianity that stands between, and is alike obnoxious to both ; in order that they may join hand to hand in deadly combat ; or, perhaps,—it is not impossible,—amicably divide the land between them, and reign together in harmony, as in the golden days of Papal omnipotence and scholastic philosophy. Meanwhile, those who shrink equally from either alternative, and who thought that they had a standing ground equally remote from both, in a faith neither taught by the commandments of men, nor wavering with their caprices, but founded on the word of God, are apt to fare ill in the present warfare of opinions, being thus pressed and assailed on both sides ; and it is due to their losing hold of their sure anchorage in the truth, that many have been driven by the wild eddies and currents of these agitated days, either to dash against the Scylla of Rome's authority, or to be sucked in to the whirling Charybdis of scepticism. It is of the most vital importance, then, for the security of our position, to be able to make out a difference between Rationalism and true Protestantism ; and that not a mere difference in results or special opinions, but an essential and fundamental difference in principles : and, in like manner, to shew a similar radical distinction between evangelical Anti-Rationalism and Romanism. In a word, it is needful to prove that there is a middle position, equally distant from, and equally secure against, the attacks of the Romanist, on the one hand, and the Rationalist on the other ; and the point in regard to which we must have such a twofold defence, is one of no less importance than the foundation and rule of faith ;—it is that which forms the very basis of our whole religious belief. According to the Romanist, the ultimate judge of all truth is the Church ; according to the Rationalist, it is the reason of the individual. The *Via media* of the Tractarians was an attempt to establish a middle position, such as the exigencies of the case, as we have seen, require. Dr Newman's Autobiography has disclosed to the world the *rationale* of that movement. It was his intense repugnance to Liberalism, and his earnest desire to obtain a safeguard from it, yet maintaining a position against Rome on the other side, that led him to the peculiar theory aptly

designated the *Via media*. Its principle, briefly stated, was, to make, not reason, not the Church, but antiquity, the supreme judge of truth. For a time it was held with great confidence and boldness; but ultimately, even by the admission of its chief author, it entirely broke down. Its defences were strong enough on the side of Rationalism, standing as it did on ground far enough apart to be beyond the range of its arguments; but its walls, on the other side, were too near Rome to stand long against her assaults; and one after another they crumbled to pieces, and left those who had trusted to them no alternative, but to surrender at discretion, and march out under the yoke as captives to the authority of Rome, or to flee in dismay from the dismantled fortress. Antiquity is clearly not capable of affording a tenable position between the two extremes.

But why, our readers will perhaps exclaim, waste words in going round about the matter, and arriving at the result by an exhaustive discussion of expedients that have failed, when the true solution of the difficulty is ready at hand, and can be stated in a sentence? Protestantism places the right of ultimately judging all questions of faith, not in reason, nor in the church, nor yet in antiquity, but in the Bible, and this is surely a distinct enough middle position, equally removed from either extreme. This would, we suppose, be the general answer given to the question we have raised. It seems to be the answer given and considered sufficient by Dr Hurst. He says, p. 25:—

“It was a favourite view of the Rationalists, that the Reformation had been produced by reason asserting her rights, and it was then an easy step to take, when they claimed as much right to use reason within the domain of Protestantism, as their fathers possessed when within the pale of Catholicism. But there were wide points of difference between the Reformers and Rationalists. The former would return to the spirit and letter of the word of God; while the latter did not hesitate to depart from both. The former accepted the Bible as it is, making faith its interpreter; the latter would only construe its utterance as reason would dictate.”

Now we admit, of course, that this is true and very important; the Bible, and the Bible alone, is the religion of Protestants; this statement does indeed indicate the great leading principle of Protestantism as distinguished from Romanism. But it does not quite go to the root of the matter, or touch the absolutely fundamental and ultimate principle, which it is important to bring out, especially when we have to deal with Rationalism. The truth is that, strictly speaking, the Bible cannot be directly and simply appealed to by the Protestant as occupying the place which

the Romanist gives to the church, and Rationalism to reason. For both of them would reply with one voice, You mistake the question at issue ; it is not denied that the Bible is the word of God, and as such true and infallible ; we both admit that as well as you (many Rationalists doubtless would not say that, but some could), but that is not sufficient, there are questions that the Bible, be it ever so infallible, cannot decide. How do you know that it is the word of God ? How can you be sure that you understand its meaning aright ? Even if, on all other questions, the Bible be the supreme judge, yet it cannot be on these, and these are the questions that arise last, and may always be put, after every other one is answered ; the Bible cannot be the ultimate judge of truth, we have need of some other power to tell us at least what is Scripture and what is its true meaning. I say that other power is the church, my friend here says it is reason ; but we both agree that, whether it be the church or reason, its office is simply to authenticate and interpret the word of God. And if the Protestant still protested that the word of God did not need such witness or interpreter, the adversaries might both reply with the scoffing couplet :—

“ Hic liber est in quo quærit sua dogmata quisque,
Invenit et pariter dogmata quisque sua.”

The simple assertion of the Bible alone as the religion of Protestants, might seem to afford a foundation for such a *via media* as we are in quest of ; but when brought to the test, it will prove as treacherous as that of the Tractarians. Its danger, however, comes from the opposite side. It is safe enough as against Rome, and far enough removed from that extreme, but it lacks any sufficiently strong barrier to secure us from gradually and insensibly sliding into scepticism. The Bible is accepted as authoritative ; but as we have seen it must be both authenticated and interpreted, and for these ends, unless I am simply to acquiesce in some Protestant council or confession instead of that of Rome, I have only my own faculties to use ; I set out indeed with the full purpose of using them always in subordination to Scripture, and not as the Rationalist does as its judges. But how do I fare as I proceed ? In examining the evidence for the books of the Bible, I may not be able to acquiesce in the received canon ; I may like many learned critics have doubts about the Second Epistle of Peter, or like Luther reject that of James ; and if the evidence in their favour does not convince me, I have no alternative but to use my own judgment and reject them. Then I come to the contents of Scripture. I have been led to recognise it as divine partly, perhaps mainly, by the heavenliness of its teaching. But I find some things which seem

to be unworthy of God, and inconsistent with his character; I cannot receive them. I endeavour to evade the difficulty by modifying my view of inspiration, and supposing there may be errors or inaccuracies in some parts of the Bible, I have recourse to forced and unnatural interpretations, to avoid what I cannot receive; but presently I find that neither of these expedients will suffice, and I must admit, that the Scriptures do teach these obnoxious doctrines. What am I to do now? is the question. You ought to submit to the Bible, and accept these doctrines in spite of your difficulties, would be the answer given by the orthodox Protestant. Yes, I reply, I would do that willingly, if I was sure that the Bible is the word of God. But it was only my reason that assured me of that at first, and now my reason tells me equally plainly that what the Bible says is not true. I accepted it at first among other reasons because of the doctrine it contained, and now it is this very doctrine that stumbles me. I must go back upon my former admission, and at the very least exercise the right of judging of the character of the Bible and of all its parts, and rejecting any portion or statement of it, not merely on external but internal grounds; and if I hesitated about some books at first, because of a lack of evidence, I may now reject many others because of their contents. I began with a real reverence for the Bible; but having no other witness for it save my own reason, this is what I have come to, and wherein does my position differ from that of the extremest Rationalist? Nay, if I go far in the way of criticising the Bible, the thought may ere long occur, whether it would not be better and honester to give it up altogether and instal reason alone as the rule of my faith. Such a course is not impossible, nay, not unexampled in our day. We have an instance of it portrayed in the autobiography of Francis Newman. He, as well as his brother, endeavoured to tread a middle way, but it broke down with him as completely as the Tractarian one did, landing him not on the rock of implicit faith but in the vortex of infidelity.

Where then shall we find a safe foothold in the present chaos of opinions? Is there no way of maintaining a sure and well-grounded faith? Is it only by being illogical, by stopping short of the legitimate consequences of my principles, or by continually shifting my ground from one set of principles to another, that I can avoid running into either Romanism or Rationalism? Is there no real and solid middle path by which I can go in safety? It might seem, indeed, that no such way is known to many in the present day; and when we trace the mental history of such men as the two

Newmans, we are almost insensibly led to fancy that no such way exists at all ; but however much it may have been lost sight of since, there is such a way, which was well known to our reforming ancestors, and diligently trodden and stoutly defended by them. They knew well what they were about, and did not commit themselves or lead their followers to any such devious courses as those in which later theorists have made shipwreck of their faith. They saw the difficulties and requirements of the case, for they were pressed upon them by their popish adversaries. These could not, indeed, cast in their teeth, as their successors can do now, the wild excesses of Rationalism, as if these were the natural fruits of their revolt from the Church of Rome, for these errors were then undeveloped and could not have been foreseen. But the Romish controversialists did not fail to allege that the Protestants, in repudiating the authority of the Church, had renounced all possibility of absolute certainty and security in matters of religion. They might have grounds, more or less probable, for their opinions, but these they alleged were at best only probabilities, not certainties ; in the last resort, they had nothing but their own judgment to rely upon, and therefore they had no security that they might not be led into one error after another, while they imagined all the while they were following the truth to the best of their power. Whereas they who followed implicitly the teaching of the Church, had in it, as they maintained, an infallible guide to secure them from error, and give them absolute certainty of the truth of their faith. And this office and power of the church they upheld, not as superseding the word of God, but as its living witness and interpreter. This was the Romish position which the reformers had to face, and they did not shrink from meeting it fairly. They did not, indeed, admit that their adversaries themselves could rationally have that absolute certainty of which they boasted in the infallibility of the Church ; and they carried the war into the enemy's camp by exposing the vicious circle in which they argued, alternately proving the Bible from the Church, and the Church from the Bible. But they also maintained that they had a more excellent way, and that they could attain, not a mere probable persuasion, but an absolute certainty, for their faith. This they did, not merely by asserting the inspiration and infallible authority of Scripture as the sole rule of faith, but by bringing to light again that great truth which Rome had obscured by her exaltation of the church, that the Holy Spirit is to each individual the divinely promised and

authorised witness and interpreter of the word; so that our faith in the Bible as the word of God, and in this or that doctrine as taught in it, does not rest ultimately in the wisdom of man but in the power of God, and is not a mere human probability but a divine certainty. This was the true Protestant position, in opposition to the Church of Rome; and it was on the claims of the church, as against these of the Spirit, that the controversy then turned. That this was the ground taken by the reformers is well known, and we need not waste words in proving it. The state of the question is clearly indicated in the title of one of the chapters of Calvin's Institutes, and it is one of the most admirable chapters of that most admirable book. Lib. i., c. 7, "Quo testimonio Scripturam debeat sanciri, nempe Spiritus, ut certa constet ejus autoritas; atque impium esse commentum, fidem ejus pendere ab Ecclesiæ judicio;" and the importance attached to this point may be seen from the fact that it is introduced into several of the symbolical books of the Reformed Churches. We may be allowed to quote the statement of one of these, not perhaps the best expressed, but interesting as it occurs in the last of the many Bohemian confessions, exhibiting the faith of the followers of Huss, also acquiesced in by the Waldenses, approved by Luther and Melancthon, and embodied in the Harmony of Confessions. We quote it from the English translation of the latter work.

"First of all, the ministers of our churches teach with one consent concerning the holy Scriptures of the New and Old Testaments (which is commonly called the Bible, and is lawfully received and allowed of the fathers which are of best and soundest judgment), that it is true, certain, and worthy to be believed; whereunto no other human writings whatsoever, or of what sort soever they be, may be compared, but that, as man's writings, they must give place to the Holy Scripture. First, because it is inspired and taught by the Holy Ghost, and uttered by the mouths of holy men, written by them, and confirmed by heavenly and divine testimonies; which Spirit also himself openeth and discloseth the meaning, how it ought to be understood, and the truth of this Scripture in the Church, in what manner seemeth him best, especially by raising up and giving faithful ministers, who are his chosen instruments."

And we need only remind our readers of the noble language in which the same doctrine is asserted in the Westminster Confession and Larger Catechism. Now we regard this doctrine as the sure foundation of the true *via media* of evangelical Protestantism between Romanism and Rationalism. It is a clear and decisive protest against the popish

ascription of infallibility to the church, since it ascribes infallible authority only to the Spirit, and does not regard him as limited in his working to the bounds of a visible society, or the succession of ecclesiastical office, but as dealing directly and immediately, in his illuminating power, with the soul of each individual. Yet, on the other hand, it is equally safe from the boundless licence and uncertainty of Rationalism. It does provide a sure foundation for our faith. We are not left to the mere probabilities of natural reason. We have the promise of Christ, that he would send the Spirit of truth to guide his disciples into all the truth; we believe that that promise is fulfilled to all who seek it; and when it is so, we have a conviction of the truth of God's word which rests, not merely on human testimony and argument, but on the divinely wrought perception of the divine character of Scripture, and which is therefore strong enough to sustain our faith against all the difficulties reason may encounter. I will willingly submit my reason to the teachings of God's word, provided I am certified that the Bible is the word of God, and that this is its teaching, by some authority higher than my reason; above all, if it is the authority of God himself, for then I am only submitting my reason to his, as is most meet. But if I have no such assurance,—if I have no surer warrant to believe any given doctrine to be the truth of God than my own ability to discover or to prove it, I refuse to submit my reason to any such doctrine, for the chain can never be stronger than its weakest link; and to acquiesce in such a claim would be to submit my reason to itself, an act impossible or suicidal to a rational creature. If reason be the ultimate warrant of Scripture, then reason must and will be the supreme judge of truth; it is only if the Bible be its own witness, or, what is the same thing, if the inspiring Spirit be the witness of the inspired word, that reason can be legitimately restricted to the humble office of an interpreter. The recognition of the need and reality of the testimony of the Spirit to and by the word forms an essential and fundamental difference between our doctrine and Rationalism, and it is the only thing, we believe, that can permanently keep reason in its true place. At the same time, this doctrine has the further advantage of affording a solid basis for liberty of thought, without taking up the position, which so many of the current defences of toleration express or imply, that truth is either altogether uncertain or entirely indifferent. It is true that the doctrine of the testimony of the Spirit requires to be somewhat cautiously stated, in order to guard against the misapprehension or the risk of its giving countenance to mysti-

cism or fanaticism. Even in the days of the Reformers, it was carried to excess in this direction by the Anabaptists, and other less odious sectaries; and in later times, besides avowed mystics, the Pietists in Germany, and the Methodists in England, have been accused, whether with or without foundation, of pushing it to an unwarrantable and dangerous extent. But it has been fully considered in all its lights by the most clear-headed and sober-minded men, under the additional scrutiny of all the objections of the acutest Romish controversialists, and the result has been, that it is stated by all the great systematic theologians of the seventeenth century, in a form in which it can be most thoroughly defended against all objections. However it may be ridiculed by some, we do not hesitate to regard it as the very palladium of evangelical truth, and we do not know another sure foundation of our faith on Protestant principles.

It would be an interesting and instructive task to trace the history of the rise and progress of Rationalism in the light of this principle, and to observe whether the growth of that error has not been coincident with the forgetfulness or denial of the testimony of the Spirit to the truth. It was, as we have seen, maintained and defended in the most earnest way by the first Protestants, both in the Lutheran and Reformed Churches; it was only denied by the Socinians, who acknowledged indeed the authority of Scripture, but made reason its test and interpreter, and thus were the precursors of the Rationalists. But as time rolled on, when the fresh awakening of religion at the Reformation began to die away, and the spiritual life of the churches to decay, it is not surprising that this doctrine, which requires, above all, spiritual discernment, should be disregarded and lost sight of. It was still indeed allowed a place by the theologians in their systems, but it was apt to be forgotten in practice; while most of those men who are noted as making a stand against the progressive declension of the age proclaimed it:—Jacob Boehme in an exaggerated way, Spener and Arndt in a more judicious, and therefore more effective, manner. It was in vain that an unspiritual orthodoxy sought to defend itself by stronger statements of the inspiration of Scripture, and the importance of sound doctrine: and it is remarkable that the last of the Reformed confessions, the Swiss Formula Consensus of 1675, which contains the most extreme and injudicious statement of the inspiration of Scripture, does not make the slightest allusion to the old Protestant doctrine of the testimony of the Spirit. The revived criticism and philosophy of the seventeenth and eighteenth

centuries found the churches to a large extent removed from their old and sure footing, and fighting the battle on treacherous ground. We are glad to be able to quote, in support of this view, so high an authority as Hagenbach. Speaking of Lessing, who was one of the chief forerunners of the Rationalists, he says:—

“As the Protestant church, in contradistinction to the Catholic, had asserted that the Bible was the foundation of all religious inquiry, Lessing sought to shew that Christianity was older than the Old or New Testament, which had their rise within the Christian church; he went directly back to the most primitive doctrine framed by the earliest fathers, from the verbal sayings of men and an oral tradition. On this living spiritual power, which linked the early believers to each other, rests, according to Lessing, the framework of the church, while the Bible is but the plan of the church on paper. . . . And this reasoning of Lessing was not without some good foundation, for Protestants had let a belief in the *living* power of the Spirit withdraw behind their belief in the written word, and always cried off the danger of the latter being attacked, while they let the former sleep. Many pious and thoughtful Protestants, particularly the mystics, had spoken of this, and tried to remedy the evil, but they could not gain a hearing. Lessing went too far in the opposite direction, and fell into an equal extreme. . . . The Protestant church would cease to be if the Scriptures were given up, although it were to be wished that we were not content with the mere dead possession of holy writ, but laid more stress upon the living Spirit, which holy writ not only makes us understand, but accept with the heart.”*

We would rather perhaps say that, instead of going to an extreme in the direction of the Protestant principle, Lessing adopted, in its germ at least, that of Rationalism; and the history of theological opinion in Germany since his time has been on a large scale, something like what the phases of faith of the younger Newman have exhibited on a smaller one. And the fact that so many of the leading theologians of that country are not only approaching more nearly the old orthodoxy, but reasserting the great Reformation principle of the Bible, not as a dead letter, but along with the

* We quote this passage from the English translation, published by T. & T. Clark, under the title of “German Rationalism” (pp. 91, 92), which we have not the opportunity of comparing with the original. But we venture to suspect that this passage at least is not quite accurately rendered; though the task of translation seems on the whole to have been faithfully executed; and the valuable work of Hagenbach has been made quite intelligible, as it is very interesting to the English reader. But surely the last clause has been misconstrued by the translator. It should certainly read thus:—“The living Spirit, who makes us not only understand, but accept with the heart, holy writ.”

living Spirit, as the foundation and rule of our faith, is one of the most hopeful signs of the times.

A very similar course of events may be recognised in the religious history of England and Scotland. Here the spiritual impulse of the Reformation was longer of exhausting itself than on the continent, the Reformers were followed by the Puritans and Covenanters; and the principle of the testimony of the Spirit was preserved as a living faith by the work of Owen on the Reason of Faith, and by the Westminster Standards. But there succeeded a period when an appeal to this was derided as fanaticism; and then came the Deists, and the age of apologies, arguments, evidences of religion, along with a general declension and deadness of evangelical godliness. Then came the revival by Methodism without, and the evangelical clergy within the church; when the work of the Spirit was again vindicated and raised to its due place, but more in its practical aspect than its bearings on theology. In this latter relation it has, we venture to think, not yet been fully acknowledged; and thus the door has been left open for the inroads of Romanism on the one hand, and of Rationalism on the other, that distinguish the present day.

All this serves to shew, how close and intimate is the connection between truth and life, between evangelical soundness and spiritual religion. It has ever been found in the history of the church, that a declension of spiritual life has been either accompanied or followed by a departure from Christian truth. Sometimes indeed the two have been found apart, but it has only been for a short season. There have been times, when a strict formal orthodoxy has co-existed with an absence of spiritual life; but it has generally been found that the deadness in practice very soon brought about either a reaction or a corruption that speedily destroyed the theoretical orthodoxy. And on the other hand, if sometimes we see real earnest religion combined with very defective or erroneous views of the truth, may we not hope that the power of the life will gradually bring about a more full and correct knowledge of the truth, according to that word of the Saviour, "If any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine whether it be of God." Nor can we wonder at this close connection, if it be so that God has appointed his Spirit, who is the only and all sufficient source of all true godliness, to be also the teacher and witness of the truth. If this be so, the church cannot lose her hold of the one without, sooner or later, having the other wrested from her grasp. The only real and lasting security for the continuance of sound doctrine in the church, is the continual presence and working

of the Spirit of truth. The Holy Ghost is the river of living water, the streams whereof make glad the city of God. Popery hardens and crystallises the living stream into an icy mass, making it more definite and tangible indeed, and more bright and brilliant as it glitters in the sun, but withal hard, dead, and motionless, incapable of really imparting life; the Spirit is supposed to testify through the outward organism of the church, and to work only through its ordinances. On the other hand Rationalism, ignoring or denying the work of the Spirit altogether, dries up the stream entirely, and leaves only empty channels that mock the thirst of the beholders. The living water may be something less definite and tangible, not so easy to limit down or pourtray exactly, but it supplies the real want of the city, as neither the frozen glacier nor the empty channel can do. So it is not so easy, in some respects, always to realise the testimony of the Spirit, as to rely either on ecclesiastical authority or enlightened reason; it requires an eye directed to the unseen, and a heart attuned to the melodies of heaven; it is always an easier thing to acquiesce in the idea that the Spirit speaks through the good and godly when we can see and hear, and who form the church, or that the dictates of our own reason are all the voice of the Spirit we are to expect; hence the facility with which either Rationalistic or Romanising principles have insinuated themselves into the church; but in either of these ways we would be substituting something dead and formal for the living Spirit, whom the Saviour has sent as the guide and teacher of his church. This, as we read it, is the great lesson taught us by the history of Rationalism.

ART. VII.—*The Lives of some of the more Celebrated Jewish Rabbis.*

Hi. Relandi Analecta Rabbinica. 1723. *Trajecti ad Rhenum.* Sephardim, or, the History of the Jews in Spain and Portugal. By JAMES FINN. 1841. London.

AMONG the various influences that have produced the present state of Biblical knowledge throughout Christendom, we are not to overlook the element that has been contributed by the Jewish Rabbis, from the twelfth century downward to the period of the Reformation. Forming a language of their own, simple and yet comprehensive, severely philo-

sophical and exact, built upon the basis of the scriptural Hebrew, yet borrowing its nomenclature from the languages of every country of their captivity and exile, from the ruins of Babylon to the wharfs of Amsterdam, the Rabbis, like their ancient forefathers, have made themselves possessors of the treasures of the gentiles, in taking and fabricating into a dialect, conformable to the genius of their own venerable tongue, terms of life, and learning, and science, and art, from the Arabic, and the Chaldee, and the Syriac, and the Greek, and the Latin, and the Italian, and the German, and the Dutch, and the Spanish, and the Portuguese ; and have embodied in those mystic symbols, like so many emblems of victory over entile nations, the results of their labours in the criticism and interpretation of those sacred records, which, in many respects, they must be allowed best to understand, as being originally written in their native tongue, of which they were made the earliest depositaries, and in relation to which we may still say, they are the librarians of the world. There is a strong and wide-spread prejudice against the literature and intelligence of the Jews ; and, even among Christian men, it has been too generally supposed, that abstracting from the inspired productions of the Hebrew Scriptures, wisdom has entirely perished from the sons of Abraham. The conclusion, like other prejudices, has its origin in ignorance. Because they have heard of the fables of the Talmud, how that the hostler of Rabbi Judah, the Holy, was more rich than the king of the Persians, or how every member of the great Sanhedrim was skilled in seventy languages, or how Rabbi John Ben Narbai despatched three hundred calves and three hundred flagons of wine to dinner, or how three hundred asses were scarcely able to carry the keys of the treasure-houses of Korahi, or how David, by the flight of a single arrow, killed eight hundred men at once, or how two thousand soldiers, in the army of Coziba, were endued with such adroitness, that whilst they rode past, by a simple twitch of their right hand they could each pluck up by the roots a cedar of Lebanon,—such persons, tickled with such curious marvels, and being at once strangers to the genius of the East, abounding in fiction and allegory, and incapable of relishing the sly humour of the expatriated rabbi, who was often glad to seize the breathing-time of persecution, in framing an astonishing story, or indulging a bright day dream, or building a castle in the air, have hastily and erroneously concluded, that all the learning and acquirements of the modern Hebrews are nothing but a collection of falsehood and infatuation. A judgment as fallacious and unfounded, in regard to Hebrew

literature, as if from the Adventures of Jack the Giant-Killer, or the Travels of Baron Munchausen, or the Exploits of King Arthur and the Knights of the Round Table, a stranger to the comprehensive literature of our country, should rashly and dogmatically conclude that the literature of England was utterly unacquainted with the living germs and matured lucubrations of a rich and intellectual philosophy. The fact is, there is no department of philosophy in which the modern Jews have not excelled; they have enriched their language by a transfusion into their peculiar dialect of the finest works of Greece, and Persia, and Arabia; Aristotle, and Plato, and Euclid, and Hippocrates, and Galen, and Avicenna, and Averroes, and Sacrobosco, are found clothed with the dignity of a Hebrew dress; and original treatises in grammar, and logic, and metaphysics, and criticism, and arithmetic, and algebra, and geometry, and astronomy, and the most subtle and learned questions in hermeneutics and theology start up in the old language of the rabbi, with an accuracy and a skill, with a severity and a precision, that may with the utmost ease compare with the works of the acutest schoolmen, or the most accomplished mathematician in any country or in any age. There can be no question, that from the time of the dispersion of the Hebrews from the College of the Gaonim, in Babylon, and their consequent settlement in Cordova, in 1039, down to their expulsion from Spain, in 1492, when, according to Mariana, 800,000 were banished, the Jews were the most learned, scientific, and enterprising men in Europe. They filled the chief offices in the court of Spain; they adorned the academies of Cordova, and Seville, and Granada; they were the chief assistants of Alonzo the Tenth, surnamed the Wise, in making his sidereal observations, and compiling his astronomical tables, and publishing his Book of Circles; in that Chaldean science, they were the instructors of the Moors, and the forerunners of that brilliant course of discovery, which, under Henry Duke of Visco, and Vasca de Gama, revealed the headlands of Africa, doubled the Cape of Good Hope, and opened up a maritime road to the commerce and riches of India: they carried the astronomy of Chaldea, and the dialectics of Greece, and the chemistry of Spain, into the universities of France and of England; they taught in the universities of Paris and of Oxford; and students from different parts of the world came flocking to the plains of Andalusia.* The works that the Jews have published in Venice, in Thessalonica, and in Constantinople, and throughout the towns and cities of Ger-

* Finn's Sephardim, p. 229.

many, are a sufficient refutation of those who imagine that this sort of literature abounds in few authors. Many thousands of volumes of Rabbinical literature, in every species of excellence, are to be found in the Jewish catalogues. And one may boldly affirm of the multitude of Rabbinical books existing at this day, in every sort of art and science, that the Hebrews, even in this respect, may with perfect facility be compared with any Gentile nation. *

“ A miraculous people,” says Mr Finn, “ they still command the attention of the world, even in their fallen state ; and the intellectual or moral advancement of mankind, with all the gigantic march of events, does not preclude the certainty of God’s express arrangements for Israel. While the infidel sneers at them as the ‘ Pariahs of the globe,’ or the more friendly Christian, in reverting to their long past history, and looking for their promised spiritual regeneration, as well as the national return to their own land, designates them ‘ the aristocracy of the world ;’ as yet the Hebrew walks on in his self-conceited stubbornness ; empires become extinct, tribes and languages become amalgamated ; but, these remain an indestructible race ; they are dealt with by an unparalleled discipline, and an unparalleled result will hereafter redound to the glory of God.”†

Such are the remarks of the modern historian of “ The Sephardim,” a clear and an entertaining narrative of the sojourn of the Jews in Spain.

“ The character of the race,” says an able writer in the *Times*, “ is, in the main, everywhere the same ; but in each country there is a different variety, and the Jews of Turkey are not the least interesting. The English species we know well. The showily dressed gentleman, with rings and breastpin, bushy black whiskers, and a mouthful of glittering teeth, who keeps a gig, and is connected with a theatre, is one variety. Then there is the flaxen-haired type, generally poor and shabby, serving in cheap tailors’ marts, and bidding against each other at picture auctions. The German Jew is intellectually superior. He is more of the type which Rembrandt loved to paint, small, with dark dry features, acute, but with a mind by no means always set on sordid gains and low enjoyments. His researches are often as laborious as those of the Teutonic professors among whom he lives ; his logic is as sound, his critical powers as keen, his imagination as brilliant. As a philosopher, he adds another system to the metaphysical universe ; as a theologian, he gives a deeper meaning to the dogmatic teaching of John and Paul. The Jew of Eastern Europe is physically

* Relandi *Analecta Rabbinica*, p. 187. “ Nam non temere quis affirmaverit de multiplicitate librorum etiamum extantium in quâlibet disciplinarum specie, Hebræos cum quibuscumque gentibus facile posse contendere.”—*Genebr. Tabulæ Rabbinicæ*. The number of Hebrew works, in the Bodleian Library alone, certainly, in this respect, the richest in the world, is upwards of three thousand.—See *Steinschneider’s Jewish Literature*, p. ix.

† Finn’s *Sephardim*, preface, p. ix.

the finest of his race. The bearded old Hebrew, who comes from Poland, with a wallet at his back, is often caught by admiring artists, and made to sit for portraits of Abraham or Eli. These Constantinople Jews are mostly relics of the tribe, who fled from the fires of the Inquisition in Western Europe, and their thick Shemitic Spanish is still heard in the close alleys where they congregate, outcasts lower than the lowest, and beings on whom the meanest Rayah may inflict in turn the insults which he receives from his Turkish master. They are a quiet race, slender, and stooping, with something weak and idiotic in their features, which are far more delicate than those of their English countrymen. Occasionally, there is one whose countenance might have been intelligent, if a better fortune had ever allowed any noble or elevating thoughts to be presented to the dormant mind, or the sun of hope had ever broken through the chill mist of contempt and poverty, which must encircle the journey of his life. 'Though they are what they are, one can still imagine that in the schools of Cordova and Toledo, their forefathers were great in philosophy and medicine; that they were the physicians of emperors and kings, and even gave many a bishop to the Church which persecuted them. However, the descendants are poor and miserable, earning a scanty meal by the sale of stationery and petty wares; and, there they stand, at the entrance of the bazaar, whispering confidentially to each Englishman that passes, and offering their services with that mysterious air of secrecy, which characterizes their race.' *

But it is chiefly as theologians, and commentators on their own Hebrew Scriptures, that the modern Jews stand prominently forward. And it cannot be denied that there is a deep and subduing interest in pondering over the hallowed records that have been inspired by the Spirit of God, and commented upon in different dialects, but still with the same intense admiration, by the hoary Rabbi, and the anxious Hacham, who, whatever else may be their faults, scorned and detested by all the world besides, cleave to the Scriptures that their fathers have handed down to them, with all the enthusiasm of an instinctive devotion and unconquerable attachment. There is, in fact, in the perusal, as well as in the association, a strange and an overwhelming wonderment, to unfold the pages of Buxtort's folio Bible, and luxuriate over the caustic commentaries of Rashi, and Radak, and Ralbag, and Aben Ezra, shrouded in crabbed characters, and rabbinical peculiarities, with the mysteries of the greater and lesser Masora, surrounding, as with a mystic fence, the pure Hebrew of Moses and the prophets, side by side with the far less sacred, yet still venerable, Chaldee, in the classic elegance of Onkelos, or the more paraphrastic idiom of Jonathan Ben Uzziel.

* *The Times*, Monday, May 22. 1854.

“About the middle of the twelfth century,” says Dr Kennicott, “lived the four men, who did so much honour to the Jewish nation, *Maimonides*, *Jarchi*, *Aben Ezra*, and *Kimchi*.”* These are the *Rabbis*, to whose eventful lives we would wish, in the present article, shortly to allude; and, if space permit, we would also wish to add a short notice of two others, the one of whom flourished about the middle of the fourteenth century, and the other towards the close of the fifteenth: we mean *Ralbag* and *Abarbanel*. We shall endeavour to give a very short view of the career of each of those eminent individuals, in order; and,

First, of *Maimonides*. This celebrated man, who is called *Maimonides*, from his being the son of *Maimon*, is also styled *Moses the Egyptian*, from his long residence in Egypt, and *Rambam*, from the initial letters of his full name, *Rabbi Moses bar Maimon*. He was born at Cordova, on the eve of the Passover, in the year 1131, his mother, who was the daughter of a butcher, having died in giving him birth. At the same time, he was a descendant of *Rabbi Judah the Holy*, the compiler of the *Mishnah*, and thence by the female line a branch of the royal house of Judah. Young *Rambam* was in his boyhood of such an unpromising genius, and so little disposed to study, that he was often received with harsh words and blows by his father, and surnamed in anger *the son of a butcher*. At last, the son of the butcher's daughter was driven from his father's house. Reduced to extremity, the young man betook himself to a synagogue, where he had a refreshing sleep, and remained over the night; on awaking, *Maimonides* found himself a new man; the emergency, no doubt, quickened the latent genius of the youth; and He who directs the minutest circumstances of our lot, had now brought him to the turning-point of his earthly existence. *Rambam* fled from the face of his father, and repairing to another city, put himself under the tuition of *Rabbi Joseph ben Megas*, under whose instructions he laid the foundation of those acquirements which afterwards attained to so wonderful a height. When many years had transpired, he returned to Cordova; he kept aloof from his father's house; he harangued the synagogue on a Sabbath, when the audience was seized with admiration and astonishment; his father and relations did him honour, and received him with affection and gratitude; the son of the butcher's daughter, who had formerly been considered remarkable only for his slowness and stupidity, had now become a learned Rabbi, and an accomplished orator.

* Kennicott on Hebrew Text, vol. ii. pp 455, 456.

From Spain, Maimonides passed into Egypt, induced, it would appear, from the state of the country that gave him birth. Mahomedanism was, at this period, rife in the Peninsula; and Jews and Christians were compelled to make a profession of Islamism. In these circumstances, Rabbi Moses repaired to Cairo, supported himself by the traffic of jewels, and gave himself to the study of medicine. He, at the same time, assiduously cultivated the Hebrew and Arabic languages, and added an extensive knowledge of the Chaldee, Turkish, and Median. He was in fact possessed of the most varied and accurate erudition; he was an accomplished mathematician, and thoroughly acquainted with the whole body of the civil and canon law of the Jews; and in his treatise entitled *Yad hu-hhazakah*, that is, *The Strong Hand*, he has reduced the whole system, as huddled together in the Talmud, out of a dialect complicated and variable, and from a condition the most intricate and confused, into a code of exact order, and translucent aphorisms, contained in fourteen books, expressed in a flowing and easy style, and written in the purest and most elegant Hebrew. In these circumstances, from selling jewels of mineralogy, he now began to sell jewels of wisdom and literature. He opened a school in Egypt, in which he taught philosophy and the Jewish law, with great popularity and applause, his prelections being attended by students from different countries. His friend the Cadi, *Al-Phadel Abdol Rakem aben ali Al-Baissani*, patronised the academy; and when Abdol Rakem was raised to the sovereignty, Maimonides was appointed physician to the court. This was the earthly pinnacle of the rabbi's career.

It would appear from a letter to his intimate friend, Rabbi Samuel Tybbon, that Rambam's official duties as medical adviser were no sinecure. He lived in Egypt, and the sovereign resided in Al-Kairo, a distance of two Sabbath days' journeys, whither he had to travel every day; and when he returned, he was so oppressed and overwhelmed with attending and prescribing to a crowd of patients of all classes, consisting of Gentiles and Jews, nobles and artizans, judges and tax-gatherers, friends and foes, that sometimes he fell asleep from excess of labour, and was so worn out that he could scarcely speak. His professional labours, however, did not prevent him from sending forth to the light a series of works of extensive and accomplished authorship. A perfect master of both Arabic and Hebrew, he composed in both languages, in a style of remarkable purity and ease. And his writings are so characterised by manly sense, and depth and originality of thought, that they constitute a new era in the literature of his nation. He died in Egypt, in the year 1205, and was buried in the

Holy Land ; but whether in the city of Hebron or that of Tiberias, has not been ascertained : the Jews in Jerusalem proclaimed a public fast in all their synagogues, and the Mahomedans followed his bier during two days of its progress, and bewailed his loss as that of a common friend.

Maimonides wrote both on medicine and theology ; but his great work is his *Moreh Nebuchim*, that is, *The Expounder of Doubtful and Obscure Passages of the Hebrew Scriptures*. The author esteemed it to be his chief work, and learned men of all creeds and countries have ever held it in the highest estimation. Its expositions proceed, not upon the occult sciences of the Cabbala, or the mazy labyrinths of the Talmud, but are founded on the Scripture itself, and supported by a well-directed reason and a sound philosophy. Another work of the same nature, and built upon the same principles, is his *Maddah* or *Knowledge*.

Immediately on the publication of those works, succeeded a sensation in the synagogue, such as burst amidst the papacy on Jansen's production of his *Augustinus*, or when Pascal scattered his Provincial Letters among the swarms of the Jesuits. A yell of desperation and bigotry arose from the rabbis of Montpellier ; it excommunicated all the readers of the "*Moreh*" and the "*Maddah* ;" it kindled the flames that consumed the books in the market-place ; it flew across the waters of the Mediterranean ; it denounced the author as a heretic ; it pursued him even to the grave, and erased the inscription from his tombstone, "*The choicest of men*," and substituted in its place, "*The accursed and the heretic*." The rabbis of the province of Narbonne espoused the cause of Maimonides, and excommunicated those of Montpellier. The schism existed for many years, but was at last brought to a close in the year 1232, by the energetic intelligence and benevolent zeal of another great rabbi, David Kimchi. The party at Montpellier relented, and caused the epitaph to be restored which they had so unkindly effaced.

The chief, and indeed the only cause of the condemnation of those books by the rabbis of Montpellier, was the free and manly tone of discussion which, after centuries of intellectual bondage, they had dared to introduce. In treating of the legal precepts and ceremonies, Maimonides had assigned their final cause, on the ceasing of which, the ceremonial law must need come to an end ; and he had spoken of the first cause, and the mode of his operation on things without, in a manner similar to that of Christian theologians. The freedom and liberality of sentiment were, in fact, deemed too favourable to Christianity.

But both Jews and Christians are now unanimously of opinion that Rabbi Moses bar Maimon was one of the greatest

men of the Hebrew nation. "I do not value that book only," says Julius Scaliger, speaking of the *Moreh Nebuchim*, "but also all the works of that rabbi, to such an extent, that I am disposed to say, that he alone among the Jews, has desisted from trifling." And Isaac Casaubon speaks much to the same effect: "Moses Maimonides," says he, "was a man of solid and immense learning, of whom I think I may truly say, what Pliny formerly said of Diodorus Siculus, that he is the first among his countrymen that has ceased to be a trifler." And if the first, he certainly is not the last; for the merits of this great rabbi are now appreciated by the general mind of Israel. Their affirmation is, that "from Moses to Moses, there has not arisen one like Moses;" that is, "from Moses the man of God, until Moses the son of Maimon, there has not arisen one like Moses the son of Maimon, who in learning and acquirements is to be compared to Moses the Hebrew lawgiver." By a play upon the initial letters of his name, he is styled Râm Bëmázâl, that is, "one high among the stars," or "born under a happy constellation." And he is called Mōrēh Zēdék, "the doctor of righteousness;" and Or Hăgōlāh, "the light of the captivity."

The next rabbi that we mentioned is Jarchi. Jarchi is so called in reference to the place of his birth, viz., *Lunel*, in the south of France, which in Hebrew is *Jarach*, the moon. His full name is Rabbi Solomon ben Isaac; and hence, according to the Jewish practice, by grouping together the initial letters, he is commonly called Rashi. He was born in the year of our Lord 1105. He had no fixed teacher, but profited by the occasional instructions of different individuals. He was possessed of the quickest parts; and so addicted to the study of the Scriptures, that in a short time he was ignorant of nothing that the rabbis had written before him, on the sacred books. Having come of age, he travelled in his thirtieth year into Italy, passing thence into Greece, and proceeding as far as Jerusalem; he went through the whole of the Holy Land, and afterwards visited Egypt. When leaving Egypt, he traversed Persia, and going through Tartary, and Muscovy, and other countries of the north, he came into Germany, whence he returned into his native land in the sixth year after he had left it. Such is the narrative of Rashi's travels as given by Bartoloccio,* and it must be allowed that such a grand tour was admirably fitted for furnishing the mind of the future critic and commentator. Nor was he a scholar himself only. His three sons-in-law, Rabbi Meir, Rabbi Juda Bar Nachmān, and Rabbēnu Ephraim, were all distinguished for their literature and wisdom.

* Relandi *Analecta Rabbinica*, viz., *Vitae Celeberrimorum Rabbinorum*, p. 60.

Rashi was eminent at once for his general attainments and his commentary on all the books of the Old Testament. He also commenced an exposition, and overtook almost all the tractates of the Gemārà. He was cut off by death before he finished it; but his grandson, Rabbi Sampson, the son of Rabbi Meir, completed the work. Rashi was also a learned physician, and skilled in astrology. He understood almost all the foreign tongues, which in his notes and commentaries, especially on the sacred Scriptures, he uses for the illustration of some of the more difficult words. He had anticipated something of that science of ethnology, which in recent times has shed such a splendour on the connection of languages and the history of nations. In places where the carelessness of transcribers or the lapse of time had vitiated the text or rendered it obscure, Rashi brought the affinity of tongues to dispel the difficulty, and by the use of old Gallic words or italic vocables, obscurities started into the light of day. The style of Rashi is concise and elegant, sometimes short and abrupt, in not a few places obscure. The commentator stands in need of a commentary. And *biurim* or *commentaries* on Rashi are learned and numerous. As it was the practice of Titus Vespasian when he travelled to turn aside from the way if he saw any old ruin, aqueduct, or temple and examine it, so it was the custom of Rashi in his travels to turn off his road to cities in which there were Hebrew schools, to hear the doctors, to dispute with them, and to record their decisions in writing, and sometimes he left the written record of his own opinion, although without a name attached to it, in not a few of the academies of the Jews which he visited throughout Europe. These decisions have been gathered up and embodied in the *Gloss of the Talmud*.^{*} Rashi did much service for the Jews. He was acquainted with men as well as books. But his writings are his monument. He stands there on so high and commanding an eminence, that no less a man than Maimonides has left this testimony concerning him, "I would have written many other commentaries had I not been anticipated by that Frenchman." He died at Treves, in France, in the year of our Lord 1180, when he was consequently seventy-five years of age. His body being afterwards conveyed into Bohemia, was buried in the city of Prague, and Bartoloccio informs us that in his day an inscription on stone was still visible over his grave.

The name of Rashi stands deservedly high among the Jews. For the neatness of his manner and the laconic brevity of his style, he is called the prince of commentators. His appellation Rashi, consisting of the first letters of his own name and that

^{*} *Glossa Talmudica* ; *Vitae Celebrium Rabbiorum*, p. 67.

of his father (viz., Rabbi Solomon ben Isaac), has, in respect of his great merits, been explained to denote *Rosh Shivtè Jehudà*, “the head of the tribes of Judah.” And as the Greeks by way of eminence used to speak of Homer by the name of “the Poet,” so the Jews style Rashi Parashandatà, that is, “the Expositor.”

The rabbi whose name we noticed next is Aben Ezra. He is commonly called *Chachàm*, or “the sage,” by the Hebrews, and, as his full name is *Rabbi Abram Ben Meir Aben Ezra*, he is styled by a contraction arising from the initial letters, *הראב"ע*, *Harabaà*. He was born at Toledo, in Spain, and according to the more probable account, in the year 1119. He was an accomplished scholar, a man of science and genius. He wrote a commentary on what the Modern Jews call “all the twenty-four books,” that is, all the canonical books of the Hebrew Scriptures. Among those different books, his commentary on the book of Job stands conspicuous; and for this work, his intimate knowledge of the Arabic, by which he has been able to throw much light on many obscure words closely connected with that language, has admirably fitted him. Along with his productions on the interpretation of Scripture, he has also written others of a kindred character. He has published various treatises on pure grammar. And, what cannot meet with the same commendation, he has written not a few on the secret mysteries of the Cabbala, the occult science of the Jews, the Magic or black art of the most degraded and superstitious of the Hebrews. Emerging from that asphaltic pool, he gave his attention to pure science, and brought forth more than one tractate on the subject of arithmetic. Whilst rising in his studies to the contemplation of physical truth, he first introduced the brazen astrolabe in the use of the globes, and distinguished himself by various and valuable works in the science of astronomy, which in those days was uniformly allied with judicial astrology. Nor did he rest here; the commentator, the grammarian, the cabbalist, the astronomer, and the astrologer, was also an accomplished physician and elegant poet. His poems are composed in the rhyme of the modern Hebrews, and flow with ease and perspicuity. The following are the titles of some of them: *חי בן עפר*, *Chai Ben Mekitz*, “Let live on the Son awakened,” or, “The life of the Risen One”; on the soul, its reward and punishment, *שיר על הנשמה*, *Shir al Hanneshemà* “The Song of the Soul”; an exposition of the Jewish superstition, by which it is believed that the soul leaves the body during the night, and having related its adventures to the angels returns to the body again in the morning; *אגדלך אלהי כל נשמה*, *Agadelchà*

Elòhè col neshemà, "I will praise thee, O God of all spirits," being a morning hymn; and *ובכך נקרישך מלך*, *Vbechen nak-dishach melech*, "And thus will we praise thee, O King,"—a composition used on the great day of atonement.

As Eben Ezra was possessed of the greatest variety of talents, so he lived in the greatest diversity of countries. He was by no means confined, in his peregrinations, to that land of adopted Judaism,—the gorgeous clime of the Spanish peninsula. Possessed of a restless energy, and indomitable perseverance, and furnished with many languages, and especially the Arabic, of which he was a consummate master, and burning with an insatiable desire "to seek and intermeddle with all knowledge," Aben Ezra, like the other contemporaries of his nation, Maimonides and Rashi, was bent on travel. He visited France, and Italy, and Greece, and England, and the islands of the Mediterranean, meeting with his fate in the Isle of Rhodes. It was in England that he wrote his *אגרת השבת*, *Jghéreth Hashabbath*, "Epistle of the Sabbath day," in which the rest of the Sabbath appears to him under a figure, and instructs him how the Jews ought to observe the eve of the Sabbath immediately before, instead of immediately after, the day; at the very time that, under Henry the Second, the conqueror of Ireland, the paramour of Rosamond Clifford, and the penitent devotee at the shrine of Thomas à Becket, the Jews were expelled from England, and were leaving London in thousands, under the charge of having adulterated the coin of the realm. In that motley group was Rabbi Aben Ezra, when the circumstances of his situation would probably bring back to his mind a kindred destiny, under which, with their troughs in their *hykes*, and their oppressors' jewels in their hands, his nation was driven forth from the land of Egypt. Would that the eve of his Sabbath, as he retired from the shores of Britain, had recalled to his memory the eve of a brighter morn that burst from the tomb of Calvary; and that, amidst the sorrows of his earthly pilgrimage, he might have been enabled to feel that there still remaineth a rest for the people of God!

With talents so versatile, and fortunes so varied, it will scarcely be matter of surprise that, among his other effusions, Aben Ezra has written a poem on the *Game of Chess*. The stately language of the Hebrew patriarchs is brought down to the details of that oriental amusement; but the descriptions, at the same time, are suffused with an air of Judaic gravity. Sage counsels and moral reflections rise up, and bloom, and luxuriate, amidst kings and queens, arrayed in stately mien, and bishops with towering mitres; and knights, and horses' heads, and pawns with spherical tops, and castles with threatening turrets, whether representing by their movements, or

varying colours of white, and black, and red, and green, the shifting scenes of multiform life, or the more rapid, although not more perilous, brunt of war. The sombre severity of the Jewish sage never leaves him, and he describes the game in which the Chinese, and the Hindoo, and the Arab, and the European have delighted, with all the dignity of a Stoic moralist, or the dreamy magnificence of an opium-consuming Mussulman. As an illustration of the Rabbi's mode of moralising, in this royal game played out in rhymes, we cannot give a better instance than that of the breaking up of the game. The king, being confined to his situation by what is called *check-mate*,—a word that, originally Hebrew, has passed into every language of the earth, within whose territories chess and civilisation have entered,—“And for the king's sake,” says Aben Ezra, “all his troops are slain, and the redemption of his life is equivalent to theirs; the glory is gone, and they are no more his subjects, for their lord is slain; but, nevertheless, they may fight another battle, and those who are slain may experience a resurrection.”* A moral worthy of an old Hebrew amusing himself, amidst the sorrows of life, with a passing pageant, and from it casting his eye backward to the glory of his ancestral kings, and forward to the trembling hopes of a better world,—a reflection worthy of a rabbinical commentator on Moses and the prophets. But, alas! how far short of the saving apprehension of Him who is “the resurrection and the life.”

We have just alluded to the fact, that Aben Ezra's last abode was the isle of Rhodes, in the Mediterranean. He had reached the advanced age of seventy-five; he had seen many countries, and been engaged in many pursuits; but his earliest and last study was the sacred books of his fathers. He was reading in the twelfth chapter of the book of Genesis. He had just come to those words in the fourth verse, “And Abraham was seventy and five years old, when he departed out of Haran;” when, feeling himself dying, he made a slight alteration on the last syllable of the last word, and added two others, thus, *מחרון אף* *העולם*, *Mecharòn af haolàm*, that is, “out of the toil and turmoil of this world,” and, on so saying, he expired. Would that, like another aged Jew, he had been able to say, “Lord, now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace, according to thy word, for mine eyes have seen thy salvation;” and that, leaving the sorrows of this sinful world, he had had a well-grounded hope of another and a better, through the grace and merits of that Messiah, even Jesus of Nazareth, who “has abolished death, and brought life and immortality to light by the gospel.”

Kimchi is the Rabbi that falls to be considered next in

* Finn's *Sephardim*, p. 197. Wolfi *Bibliotheca Hebræa*, vol. i. p. 85.

order. *Rabbi David Ben Joseph Kimchi* is the descendant of a family rich in intellectual resources. His father and his brother were both literary men, and his ancestors had for generations been rulers of synagogues, and chiefs of academies, in Arragon and Castille. His common appellation among the Jews is *Radak*, being the initials of his full name. He was born at Narbonne, in the province of Languedoc, in a year that has not been exactly fixed, but which must have been about the middle of the twelfth century. For we find mention made of him, as a man of note, in the year 1192, and he was already an infirm and aged man in the year 1232, when he was engaged in settling the controversy about the *Moreh* and the *Maddah*. Without the original genius of Maimonides, or the elegance of Rashi, or the diversified attainments of Aben Ezra, David Kimchi was no mean man. He is the prince of Hebrew grammarians, and the great lexicographer of the Jews. He is also a judicious commentator on the Old Testament; and, divested of much of the superstitions of Judaism, he is sharp in his opposition to what he deemed Christianity, namely, that corrupt form of religion that is presented by the Church of Rome. It is especially in his exposition of some of the Psalms that Radak dips his pen in gall, and bites and barks at the Christians. But the childishness of some of his objections is so great, as only to shew us the uncommon power of prejudice, and the extreme weakness in some points of even the strongest minds. Of this there is a very striking illustration in his objections to the Trinity of persons in one God. He is speaking of that well-known passage in the book of Genesis, "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness;" "So God created man in his own image; in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them." Kimchi is desirous of destroying the argument for a plurality of persons in the Godhead, that arises from these words; and, after endeavouring to explain away their force, by a reference to what he calls the royal mode of speaking, and a quotation from 2 Samuel xvi. 20, "Then said Absalom to Ahithophel, Give counsel among you (or, to you) what we shall do;" feeling, we suppose, that this plural verb, "what we shall do," may undoubtedly include Ahithophel and the other conspirators along with Absalom, and not refer to Absalom alone, he has recourse to another expedient, which is so absurd and original, that, as a specimen of the wisdom of the ancients being turned into folly, we give exactly in his own words:—"My lord, my father of blessed memory," says he, "gave as his explanation, that God spoke as it were over the four elements, because he had said of the other things created, Let the earth bring forth; 'Let the earth bud with grass;'

‘Let the waters bring forth abundantly ;’ but in man, wishing to place a superior spirit, he therefore says, ‘Let us make,’ and in the same manner, ‘in our image.’ For the spirit is after the image of things above, and the body after the image of things below.” Such is the famous exposition of the learned Joseph Kimchi, the father, as adduced and patronised by the learned David Kimchi, the son ; an exposition which, if it proves anything, tells us that, whilst “the earth” and “the waters” are expressly specified by name, when the one is commanded to abound with grass, and the other with fishes ; on the other hand, the four elements, earth, air, fire, and water, are to be elegantly understood as directly addressed, although their names are never mentioned, when God says, “Let us make man in our image, after our likeness :” an exposition which, if it proves anything, proves too much ; for it does not merely explain away the plurality of persons in the Godhead, it debases the Godhead, by equalising Him with the things that are made, and reduces all to an immense pantheistic chaos,—one huge mass of atheism.

But it is chiefly as a verbal critic, a strictly grammatical commentator, that Kimchi excels. Where his prejudices as a Jew do not interfere, he is at once enlightened and generous. And he has earned immortal honour by his defence of the fair fame of Maimonides ; in allaying the evil spirit of stupid and malignant bigotry, that fastened upon the writings of that great man, and howled over his grave. The Jews of Montpellier having denounced Maimonides, and his *Moreh* and *Maddah*, those of Narbonne excommunicated the three ringleaders at Montpellier. Those of Montpellier, in their turn, despatched a messenger with letters to the sages and synagogues in other parts of France ; and, stirring up the Jews, threw back excommunications and anathemas upon those of Narbonne, and all who favoured the writings of Maimonides. The Jews of Narbonne, at this juncture, perceiving the devouring flame that was kindled, appointed Rabbi David Kimchi, a man now of age and experience, to proceed to all the synagogues of the old kingdoms of Catalonia and Arragon, and urgently press upon them, that all cities, provinces, and synagogues, should meet and deliberate, and take steps for settling this dispute, and putting down those factious men.* Kimchi having commenced his journey, could not complete it, but, hindered by bad weather and indifferent health, stopped mid way. But what he could not transact personally, he accomplished by his letters. For, in a short time, not only by the chief rabbis of those countries, but by the collective and united synagogues, with one common

* Buxtorf's Preface to *Moreh Nevochim*, p. 16.

consent, were hurled solemn excommunications and withering anathemas, by which Rabbi Solomon ben Rabbi Abraham, of Montpellier, and Rabbi Jonas, who afterwards apostatised, and David ben Saul, who by *Gematria*, or a transmutation of letters, was nicknamed the son of a menstruous woman, were all three smitten and laid prostrate. A few, however (among whom, Rabbi Joseph ben Alpháchar, held the first place), still remained firm, on the side of Rabbi Solomon and his partizans. Nor is it to be wondered at, says the younger Buxtorf, for it is an old proverb among the rabbis, *that every schemer hates the scheme that outwits him*.^{*} On the transpiring of these events, the French sages, who had first countenanced the excommunications and anathemas, were seized with fear and trembling, so that regretting the step that they had taken, they were heartily ashamed, and begging the forgiveness of those of their own province, made the most humble apology. But, the prime mover of all this dissension was not so speedily brought to his senses. Rabbi Solomon, perceiving that he was not supported by the French Jews, and that he could not accomplish the object of his desire, betook himself to the Christians; and, in the first instance, in fact, applied to the lowest and most degraded of the multitude, and persuaded them, that sundry heretics had arisen among the Jews, who entertained certain pernicious dogmas, imbibed from the writings of Maimonides; as they were in the habit of burning their own heretics, he expressed his wish, that they would proceed against the heretics of his nation in the same manner; and, in the mean time, that they would adopt measures to have the books, *Moreh* and *Maddah*, committed to the flames. Nor did Rabbi Solomon rest here, but proceeded also to the prelates of the Romish Church, and addressed them in the same manner, so that the matter at length reached the cardinal, who at that time presided over the churches of Spain; the Jews were thrown into the utmost danger, and made a general reproach.[†] But the Roman ecclesiastics had the good sense to perceive the merits of the *Moreh* and the *Maddah*; the sacred censors refused to condemn the books; and the very persons, who, on other occasions, have not scrupled to burn the Jews by thousands, making with the greatest gusto an *auto de fè* of their victims, dressed with the *san-benito*, and adorned with dancing devils, constrained by the overruling providence of God, allowed the heretics, in the present instance, to go free.

Such is a short abstract of the progress of this great controversy, which Rabbi David Kimchi had the chief merit of

^{*} Preface to *Moreh Nevochim*, p. 16.

[†] Buxtorf's Preface to *Moreh Nevochim*, p. 17.

bringing to a close. This he accomplished whilst residing under the roof of Judah Kashiit, at Abula, by the letters which he addressed to Rabbi Joseph Ben Alphacar, a physician, and the chief rabbi at Toledo (which are still extant among the correspondence of Maimonides),* as well as by his negotiations, and his general influence at once with the Jewish and the Gentile community. It is refreshing to find one rabbi thus defending the honourable reputation of another, staying the devastation of ignorant prejudice and bigoted barbarity, that would have swept away the finest monuments of Hebrew literature and genius ; and with all Kimchi's prejudices against Christianity, still cheering on with a helping hand that brighter era in his nation's history, which, in process of time, is destined to usher in the full and overwhelming conviction that Jesus of Nazareth is "the Desire of all nations," "the Prince of the kings of the earth," "a Light to lighten the Gentiles, and the glory of his people Israel."

David Kimchi was now well stricken in years, and we are not aware that he was engaged in any prominent occupation after his labours in the great controversy. Few men stand more high in the veneration of his countrymen. In allusion to his name, which signifies *a miller*, it is a common saying among the Jews, *אם אין קמח אין תורה*, *Im én Kémach, én Thorà*, "If there be no *Kémach*, there is no *Thòra* ;" that is, "If there be no *meal*, there is no *law* for the grinding of it." And, again, *אין קמח בלי קמחי*, *En Kémach beli Kimchi*, "There is no *Kemach* without a *Kimchi* ;" that is, "There is no *meal* without a *miller* ;" "no *learning* without *Kimchi*." He is also called, *ראש המדקדקים*, *Rosh Hammedakdekim*, "The Prince of Grammarians." And that not merely in reference to his work on grammar, but in relation to his expositions of sacred Scripture. As a strict grammatical interpreter, at once faithful and precise, and free from superstition, he is esteemed the most eminent of the Jewish commentators.

There are just other two Rabbis, to whose lives, if space permitted, we proposed shortly to allude, namely, *Ralbag*, and *Abarbanel*. We shall therefore endeavour to touch on the most striking points of their lives and characters, in as few words as possible.

Ralbag is the Jewish contraction, effected by the union of the initial letters of the full name of *Rabbi Levi ben Gerschom*. He was born in the year 1290. His father was a Spaniard by birth, and wrote a treatise styled *שער השמים*, *Schar Haschamàim*, "The Gate of Heaven ;" his maternal grandfather was the cele-

* *Vitæ celebrium Rabbinorum*, p. 88. *Wolfii Bibliotheca Hebræa*, vol. i. p. 810.

brated Rabbi Moses bar Nachmàn, otherwise called Rambàn ; and his grandson, by his daughter, was Rabbi Simeon bar Zemach, otherwise called Rishbatz, all distinguished as men of literature. Ralbag himself was born at Bagnols, in Provence ; whence he is commonly called "Magister Leo de Bagnolo."* By profession a physician, he gave himself to the pursuit of Theology ; but, although not destitute of learning, we cannot say with great success. He wrote treatises on philosophy, mathematics, and logic, such as as the following, viz., "A Short Exposition on Aben Raschid, that is, Averroës on the Logic of Aristotle ;" Comments on the Commentaries of Averroës on the Physics of Aristotle ;" "A Treatise on the Heavens and the Earth, their Generation and Corruption ;" another "On the Human Soul ;" a third "On Arithmetic and Astronomy, including Astrology ;" a fourth, "On the Precepts of the Jews ;" and, last of all, "Comments on the *Ghemaròth* ;" that is, Commentaries on the Expositions of the Mishna.

Besides all these works, he wrote, in the year of our Lord 1325, his famous work, מלחמות שם, *Milhamoth Haschem*, otherwise called מלחמות יהוה, *Milhamoth Adonai*, "The Wars of the Lord," in which he treats of the immortality of the soul, of the knowledge of things future, of the prescience of God, of divine providence, of the heavens and their motion, of the creation of the world, and whether it be eternal. Such are the topics discussed, in so many distinct parts, by Ralbag, in his "Wars of the Lord." It is one of the mournful illustrations of the native result of "science falsely so called," and of that judicial blindness with which God has visited the Jews, that in this work, Ralbag, seduced by the opinions and authority of Aristotle and Avicenna, maintains that the gift of prophecy is not gratuitous, but depends on certain natural powers of body and of mind ; and inclines to the belief that the world in which we live, although having undergone various changes, is in itself without beginning, and shall be eternal. In speaking of the 32d chapter of Genesis, and the persevering energy of Jacob, Ralbag has the strange hardihood to assert, that the gift of prophecy dwells only in a man that is "wise, brave, rich, and of tall stature !"† Well may we exclaim, in such circumstances, with the prophet Jeremiah, "How do ye say, We are wise, and the law of the Lord is with us ? Lo, certainly in vain made he it ; the pen of the scribes is in vain. The wise men are ashamed, they are dismayed and taken : lo, they have rejected the word of the Lord ; and what wisdom is in them."‡

Yet this same rabbi has written Commentaries on all the

* Vitæ Celebrium Rabbiorum, p. 103.

† Ibid. p. 108.

‡ Jeremiah viii. 8, 9.

books of the Hebrew Scriptures ; “ which,” says Bartiloccio, “ he expounds historically, literally, and not seldom philosophically ; ”* not, however, without the rehearsal even in them of some of the errors, which we have just pointed out.

Ralbag died in Perpignan, in the department of Eastern Pyrenees, in the year of our Lord 1370, being in the eightieth year of his age.

The last rabbi of note that we mentioned is *Abarbanel*. Let us briefly sketch his life and labours. Rabbi Isaac Abarbanèl, or Abravanèl, was born in the city of Lisbon, the capital of Portugal, in the year of our Lord 1437. Abarbanel boasted that he was a descendant of the royal house of David ; but, however that may be, there can be no doubt that the Abarbanels were a most ancient and respectable family among the Sephardim, or Spanish Jews. Abarbanel, during his life, was fond of assuming the title of Don before his name, not without a mixture of Spanish pride, and the Jews have not scrupled to call him Rab, an appellation which they give to the more learned and distinguished of their rabbis. The life of Abarbanel is full of eventful interest, both as a man and as an author. He served in the court of Alphonso V. of Portugal ; he was also employed by his son, John II. ; but, being charged with grave offences, he fled with the utmost precipitation into the kingdom of Castille. In that kingdom, true to the habits of his nation, he employed himself as a money-lender, or stock-jobber ; and, ingratiating himself into the favour of Ferdinand and Isabella, he carried things with so high a hand, that, what with his ambition and pride and grinding oppression, and strong animosity against the Roman Catholic faith, he became a considerable element in bringing about the banishment of the Jews from Spain. This sad event took place in the year 1492, by the decree of Ferdinand and Isabella, in consequence of which, no less than three hundred thousands of Jews emigrated from the kingdom of Spain within the space of three months.† Abarbanel, his wife and children, were among the number of the banished. He repaired to Naples, the residence of the king of the Two Sicilies ; and, with his accustomed skill and address, speedily acquired great influence in the court of Ferdinand, the reigning monarch. On the expedition of Charles VIII. of France against Naples, and the death of King Ferdinand, Abarbanel followed his successor, Alphonso II., to Messina, in Sicily ; but, on the death of Alphonso, in 1495, he resided for a short time in the island of Corfu. Leaving Corfu in the following year, he returned to the kingdom of Naples, and lived in Monopoli for about seven years. He then left

* *Vitæ Celebrium, Rabbinorum*, p. 104.

† *Ibid.* p. 117.

Monopoli for Venice, in which he spent the last five years of his life. He died in Venice in the year 1508, being in the seventy-first year of his age. From Venice, his body was transferred to Pavia, where he was buried in the Jewish cemetery, outside of the gate called *זנב ארוך*, *Zanàb arùch*, that is, *Cauda longa*. But, according to Bertoloccio, the cemetery of the Jews, during the time of war, was dug up, and a public street led through it, so that, at this day, the tomb of Abarbanel cannot be discovered.*

The writings of Abarbanel are not less remarkable than the rapid changes of his eventful life. Born in the midst of affluence, possessed of powers naturally quick and precocious, and having his faculties educated to the highest pitch, Abarbanel grew up at once a man of the world, and a man of letters; and, whilst he had all Jacob's subtlety and cunning, we are not sure if he was endowed with Jacob's faith. That he had within himself great resources and immense powers of application, increased by long watchings and uncommon abstemiousness, carried out into the practice of severe fasting, there can be no doubt. And the energy and rapid impetuosity with which he threw off some of his commentaries on the books of sacred Scripture, remind us of the reckless strength and ease with which a celebrated noble poet of our own day dashed off some of his most admired productions, as if the elaboration of a "Corsair," or a "Giaour," or a "Lara," or a "Manfred," were to him but a playful or an ordinary entertainment. Abarbanel composed his Commentary on the Book of Joshua in sixteen days, beginning with the tenth day of the month Chasvan, that is, October, and ending with the twenty-sixth day of the same month, in the year of our Lord 1484. After an interval of five days, he composed his Commentary on the Book of Judges in twenty-five days, beginning with the first day of the month of Chislen, that is, November, and ending with the twenty-fifth day of the same month, in the same year. After another intermission of five days, he composed his Commentaries on the Two Books of Samuel in two months and thirteen days beginning with the first day of Zebheth, or December, and ending on the thirteenth day of Adar, that is, February, in the same Jewish year. So that Abarbanel completed his commentaries on those four books of the Bible, with the short repeated breathing-time of five days, within the contracted period of little more than three months and a-half. He had, no doubt, matured his mind beforehand, by deep research and meditation; and, when the period of composition came, he had simply to direct the well-spring of thought that gushed forth spontaneously. But the

* *Vitæ Celebrium Rabbiorum*, pp. 118, 141.

effort of mind required for such a serious and continued task must be allowed to be extraordinary ; yet, nothing wearied with the toil,—or, shall we not rather say, the labour of love ?—Abarbanel was just beginning to buckle on his armour for writing his Commentaries on the Two Books of Kings, when he had been summoned to the councils of Ferdinand the Catholic, in whose service he continued eight years, reaching down to the time of the Jews' banishment from Spain. After his exile he wrote his commentaries on these two books, in Naples, in the year 1493. These particulars are detailed in the first preface to the author's Commentary on the Book of Daniel. The preface is written by R. Baruch, and contains the leading events of Abarbanel's life, which are given in chronological order.*

In the great synagogue of Lisbon, young Abarbanel had delivered lectures on Deuteronomy, at the early age of twenty. But, chiefly intent on acquiring wealth and honours in his native country, it is not until after having left the place of his birth, that we see him in all the lands of his adoption, during the course of his exile, engaged in a bright and ardent career of literary exertion. Whether he is found wandering in Castille, or Naples, or Corfu, or Monopoli, or Venice, he is busily employed with his pen in the production of works, destined to immortality. It was in Castille that he threw off his commentaries on Joshua, and Judges, and the two books of Samuel ; in Naples, he resumed his labours on the books of Kings, and finished his commentaries on the former prophets ; in Corfu, he commenced his commentaries on the latter prophets, and retouched the lectures of his youth, that he had delivered to the admiring synagogue of Lisbon ; at Monopoli, in the old country of Apulia, in what is now called the intendency of Terra di Bari,—whither he had retired for fear of the French soldiers,—he completed his commentaries on the law ; and, at Venice, and different places in Italy, in which he sojourned during sixteen years, from the period of the Spanish exile, to the day of his death, he produced writings, composed in an easy and fluent style, in which he exercised the discriminating judgment of an independent thinker ; entered the lists with the most eminent of the rabbis,* and handled the nicest and most difficult subjects of Hebrew theology.

Of Abarbanel's three sons, Judah, the eldest, was at once a physician, a scholar, and a poet ; Joseph, the second, followed the fortunes and soothed the exile of his father ; and Samuel, the third, became a Christian, and received his name in baptism from Alfonso, the grand Duke of Ferrara.

* *Vitæ Celebrium Rabbinorum*, p. 120.

† Particularly in some treatises against Maimonides.

Amidst all the vicissitudes of Isaac Abarbanel, expiring at an advanced age, a stranger in a strange land, it may not be uninteresting to know, that whether by the dint of worldly wisdom, or by that peculiar arrangement in providence, by which a Jew still receives no small share of the good things of this life, Isaac, although often reduced to straits, left his family wealthy. So that, when a few years after his father's death,* Samuel left Naples, he carried with him substance valued to the amount of † two hundred thousand ducats; that is, reckoning the ducat at 3s. 6½d. each, there was then in the hands of the rabbi's family, the sum of £35,416, 13s. 4d. sterling; a sum not to be compared to the enormous wealth of one of the Rothschilds, but certainly no contemptible fortune for the old councillor of Castille, and the ex-minister of Naples. Happy had Abarbanel, before he died, come to the knowledge of Him who is "the hope of Israel;" happy had he laid hold of Him who is "the Desire of all nations;" thrice happy, had he realised Him in whom "dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily," "in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge!"

ART. VIII.—*German History of the Reformation.*

Geschichte d. Evangelischen Kirche b. z. Augsburger Reichstage (History of the Evangelical Church until the Diet at Augsburg). V. GUSTAV PLITT. 1867.

THIS work of Gustav Plitt fills up a gap. There have been various histories of the Reformation in general, and of the German Reformation in special, which have either secured favour among scholars, or won the meed of popular approbation. D'Aubigné has carried the name of the German reformer all over Protestant Christendom. Ranke has won the suffrages of scholars on the Protestant side, and been listened to with respect by many on the Romanist side. But a book was wanting, which, within a moderate compass, and from a fresh study of Luther's own works, and of the most important literature of the time, should present to our notice the order of the reformer's convictions on the great questions of doctrine and discipline, which constitute the essence of the Lutheran Church as distinguished from the Romish and the Calvinistic.

* Namely, thirty-two years, in the year 1540.

† Vitæ Celebrium Rabbiorum, p. 138.

In a modest and thoughtful preface, Plitt declares the object of his work, which is intended to set forth the Evangelical Church as fully represented by its great earthly founder, "to delineate the era with all possible brevity, but so as to pass over or do injustice to no matter of importance." In order to accomplish this, Plitt has diligently made himself acquainted with the numerous monographs upon primary or even secondary agents in the Reformation, which have issued from the German press. He has been wisely solicitous to give due attention to all the influences which, under God, combined to the breaking off of the fatherland from Rome. We could have wished, however, that he had reminded his readers of the careful abstract of the period which has been given by Schrökh in the first volume of his *Post-Reformation Church History*.

The work of Plitt is divided into nineteen chapters, preceded by an introduction. In the introduction, taking the confession of Augsburg as his standpoint, he proceeds to shew how every confession must be viewed in the light of the times in which it originated, and that this confession was the expression of the evangelical sentiment of the age, rising up by God's guidance against the false religion of Rome. In the church of the middle ages there was a false theology, that of Rome; a worldly power, that of the empire, submissive to Rome; and a false learning, concentrated in Paris, equally accomplishing the ends of Popery. All these required to be brought down, and were, by the influence of God's truth. Germany was the fittest place for a reform to arise, as it was the foremost of the heathen nations brought under the sway of Christianity. This introduction is not a historical delineation of stages of progress or decline, it is an exhibition of great principles, which form the basis of the work that follows.

The first chapter is devoted to Luther's first development. In this division, Plitt carefully and critically sifts the established from the doubtful or legendary. Step by step, by the help of his letters and sermons, the progress, intellectual and spiritual, of the great reformer is traced. His careful training at home, according to the traditional religion of the day; his entrance against his relations' wish into the cloister at Erfurt; his spiritual anguish on account of sin, and vain efforts after self-betterment; and the comfort which came to him from his "preceptor," pointing him to the word that the Lord commanded us to hope; all are set vividly before our view. The general opinion is that Staupitz was his comforter, but Plitt thinks it more likely to have been the much less known brother Augustinian

Usingen. "Here have we," says he, "the birthday of the evangelical church. These experiences, welling up out of the depths of the human heart, are the foundation of her special views. In itself there was nothing distinctive; it was merely a history of conversion; such as the ongoing of the kingdom of God in all ages makes familiar to thousands. That such great results followed from it, lay not in it, but in divine overruling." The study which, before his spiritual enlightenment, Luther gave to the earlier and later schoolmen, he now bestowed upon the Bible, Augustine, and the mystic writers. He now discovered his great popular powers as a preacher, and in the town church at Wittemberg, attracted the crowds of hearers that made pulpit oratory once more an influence of the first order. Not only "the common people heard him gladly," but, as his pulpit name became known, students, and men of culture no longer young, flocked to the Saxon university town from all parts of Germany, and indeed of northern Europe. Here we are pointed back to Paul, and pointed forward to Chalmers. Conversion and foremost preaching power are developed simultaneously in all the three.

Next in order comes the indulgence controversy. Luther is, as yet, an obedient son of the Romish Church. He speaks of the Bohemians as heretics in separating from Rome. It is the preaching of indulgences by such as Tetzel that interferes with his usefulness as a confessor. He is the strict churchman; the indulgence vendor is the lax one. The pope's name is abused; Tetzel is virtually a calumniator of Leo X. Besides, Luther's own views here are self-contradictory as yet. He holds that God forgives freely, but sanctification here is imperfect, and whatever such imperfection is left at death, must be wiped away in purgatory by the influence of grace. His first avowed opponent was Silvester Prienius. This personage had already come forward in the interests of Obscurantism, as an antagonist of Reuchlin. He was followed by Tetzel, and a more distinguished man by far than either, John Eck of Ingolstadt. Controversy with them drew Luther into closer study of the Bible, and also into special historical researches, which convinced him that the schoolmen had in this matter of indulgences, and in other things, departed from the earlier fathers, and from the word. His views became clearer, though not yet entirely free from mystic and other unbiblical elements. His was a theology learnt bit by bit, in struggle after struggle. His was a theology which sprang in no small degree from the consciousness of his own spiritual wants, and the pastoral or friendly experience of the spiritual wants

of others. The theses against indulgences of October 1517, and the Heidelberg Disputation of the following April, are the chief events in Luther's history during this period. Plitt concludes his sketch thus:—

“The first contest had broken out about indulgences as the chief practical mischief of the moment, and so far as this point was concerned, the victory in Germany was already decided. Luther had now cut the ground entirely from under the whole indulgence doctrine. His proof of the evil of it was so decisive, that all men of sound views must acknowledge it. He openly declared that indulgences brought no benefit, were suited only to the slothful; and to the reproach that he stood alone against the Church, he replies, ‘The truth is with me, and many others who doubt the value of indulgences.’ The Church has never yet decided what is to be held on this point. To determine the question, a general council, really representing the Church, ought to be called, though it may be feared we of this age are ‘not worthy of such an honour.’ Luther stood not alone. He was supported by the help of all the better minded, who recognised the truth of what he said, and had long wished for such a defender of the truth to arise. The doctrine of indulgences was so indefensible against such a serious assault as it now experienced, that even in the following year, Eck, in the Leipsic Disputation, handled it as a hopeless question. Among the mass of the people, the apprehensions of Tetzel were soon verified; indulgences in Germany fell almost universally into contempt. The impudent preacher of indulgences, whom his co-religionists soon made a scapegoat, was obliged to hide himself behind the walls of the Dominican convent at Leipsic. And when his archbishop, some years after, tried to revive again the once so profitable trade of indulgences, a single letter of Luther, from his ‘Patmos,’ was sufficient to bring the effort to nought.

“But the abuses and errors of the church stood in close connection with one another. The defenders of indulgences sought to prop them up by reference to other doctrines, and Luther followed them into their defences and laid bare their weak points. The reformation of the church, now fairly begun, could not stop here.”—(P. 108-9.)

In his next chapter, Plitt describes the Augsburg negotiations. The choice of Cardinal Cajetan was unwise; he had exalted the papal dignity as few, even of the adherents of Rome, had done, and he knew of nothing but the scholastic theology and the power of the see of Peter to oppose to Luther's views. But in Luther, as in his great predecessors Wickliffe and Huss, the study of the word and the grasping, with the whole soul, the personal relation of the redeemed soul to Christ, made either instrument utterly powerless either to attract or to overawe him. He is led, at this period, to doubt whether the Roman Curia, still distinguished by him from the Pope and the Church, be not Antichrist (P. 125).

The next chapter brings before us the Leipzig Disputation. The exaggerated papalism of Cajetan is replaced by the worldly craft of Charles Miltitz, but equally in vain. Frederic the Wise cannot be cajoled, any more than frightened into compliance with the demands of Leo. The ready-witted but unsteady Carlstadt comes forward as the defender of Luther, but is no match in knowledge of the field of debate for Eck. Luther appears, and by nearly universal confession, overthrows the Ingolstadt doctor. The Reformer, in the further prosecution of his historical studies, discovers the untenableness and unchristian character of many of the decretals; as yet he considers these forged. In opposition to the standpoint of Eck, who maintains the church must have a head, and that head is the pope, Luther replies, Christ only is the head, otherwise when the pope dies, there is a want of a ruler. The ancient church did not, the Greek Church does not, recognise the papal supremacy. From the Acts of the Council of Constance themselves he discerns the evangelical character of some of the condemned views of Huss. It is obvious, that neither in papalism nor conciliarism can he much longer believe.

From the Disputation, Plitt next proceeds to its immediate consequences. One of those was Luther's perception of the difference in point of authority between the canonical and apocryphal books, to which he was led by the defence of purgatory (which he now utterly disbelieved in) from the second book of Maccabees. "The church," he now says, "can give a book no more authority than it already possesses" (p. 155). Here Plitt well remarks:—

"It was not Luther's practice, when he considered a doctrine, to view it on all sides, and form thoroughly accurate conceptions of it from every point of view. He was not a man of the Schools, but a practical man. He occupied himself with doctrines, when the wants of the spiritual life of the church were involved in it, and this practical way of viewing them made him often seem one-sided, until further arguing enlarged his thoughts. At other times, and for other purposes, he resumed consideration of the same points, and thus appeared somewhat inconsistent with himself. But in all his utterances, from pulpit or press, he imparted somewhat from his own spiritual life, in his firmness and conscientiousness. It might well happen that others, following out his views, got the start of him in some matters of belief or practice. But they were not, for that reason, better qualified than he was to be the leaders in the reform. In the things of the kingdom of God, self-chosen ways are unavailable, even when they are right. Luther was the real reformer of the church, because he had no intention of being such, and only went so far as the head of the church shewed him the way in his own spiritual experiences."—(Pp. 152–3).

He immediately after instances Melancthon, as having given up the belief in transubstantiation sooner than Luther.

The concluding words of the just quoted paragraph seem to us one-sided. Luther was qualified to take the foremost place in the German Reformation by his knowledge of men, and his varied popular gifts of writing and speaking. He was, in large, the German of his day. No contemporary, except Latimer, had such a hold of what we may call the church-going public. He was a Teutonic Bunyan, a sixteenth century Spurgeon, and therefore he left far behind, in immediate and widespread both popularity and usefulness, men of far wider culture than himself. Scholars then, like such literary men of our own day as Sir J. Stephen and Hallam, would feel often out of sympathy with so rough and ready a spokesman as Luther, whose pen speaks rather than writes. Neither the Gray of the last century nor the Tennyson of the present could really fully appreciate Burns. The man of culture, who can afford, and who delights to take his time, to polish, to alter, to improve, in the interests of mere art, never is in perfect sympathy with the free out-pourer. The classical theologian, the man of minute theological accuracy, must go out of himself fully to appreciate his more impressing, and more venturous, brother servant of Christ. In the above quoted paragraph of Plitt, as in some other parts of his volume, we trace a disposition to set the guidance of the head of the church apart from the influence of the "diversity of gifts" which he has imparted. If Luther had not been an eminently, variedly, suitedly gifted man, surely, without miracles, he never could have effected what he did. Adaptation is as eminent a proof of the Saviour's presence as superintendence. "I am with you always," includes as much of the former as of the latter.

Plith, throughout his book, fairly presents to our view the different local or separated helpers of Luther. These were, in the early days of the Reformation, aided by a remarkable similarity of providential protection to the Jerusalem experiences, as they are traced to us in the early chapters of the Acts. Pentecost and its amazing results are interposed between the crucifixion and the martyrdom of Stephen. Only threats—not followed up—attest the attention and hostility of the Sanhedrim. So in Germany. This was owing to the easiness of some of the prelates, and the partial sympathies with reform of others.

We have an interesting account in this chapter of the reforming activity of Eberlin v. Guntzburg, who, like many

others then, was obliged to be evangelist rather than pastor, by fluctuations of magistratic or popular opinion. Plitt cannot account for his disappearance from the field of action after the peasants' war. The usual view is that he died about that time.

Luther was now the most popular of German writers. There were thirty-one editions of works of his in the vernacular in 1519. His Expositions of the Galatians and of the First Psalm belong to this year. We could have wished some insight from Plitt into the prices of books then, and the facilities for their dispersion. Colportage, probably, was a powerful aid to the incipient Reformation.

As Plitt writes from a thoroughly spiritual standpoint, and considers the Reformation in its highest character, as the great revival of the sixteenth century, he has little sympathy with the Humanists, and shews that the help they gave—some only for a while, all with limitation—to Luther was, though used, neither sought for, nor thoroughly relished by him. On the other-hand, he has entire sympathy with the humblest—the least cultured—the feeblest in gifts—even the most one-sided in view, who were really influenced by divine grace to aid the Reformation. The want of materials, at the distance of three centuries, however, is here greatly in his way. We must content ourselves with the suggestiveness of such remarks as this:—"Wittenberg was now a city, not of Saxon, or even German, but of European reputation." The students who were won to, or confirmed in the truth there, were a "sweet savour of Christ" to many districts at home and abroad. Our own Patrick Hamilton (not alluded to in this volume) is doubtless one instance out of multitudes. In a day like ours, where no work of God seems left free from immediate publicity on the largest scale—when one almost thinks that people wish the judgment day to bring no spiritual good to light—it may not be amiss to recall to mind that a nameless woman represents in one chapter of John a great revival—that six words elsewhere in the same gospel represent another wide religious change—and that years of spiritual progress for all Palestine are summed up in one sentence of the Acts. Enough for us as it is, to know that Puritanism and Methodism, at their highest spiritual flow, were only repeating the great tide of revival under Luther and his evangelical coadjutors. "The Lord gave the word; great was the company of those that published it," and received it. The word was fresh in matter, free in offer, and full in result.

In recording, in his next two chapters, the casting out of Luther from the Church of Rome by the Pope, Plitt hardly to

our mind dwells enough on the value, in Church History, of the Bull "Exsurge Domine" of the 16th May 1520. In this forty-one propositions, taken from Luther's works, are pronounced heretical. The first of these is his denial of the sacrament as "ordinances of the new law conferring grace on the receivers." This, of itself, is enough to shew the irreconcilable difference of his views from every form of Sacramentarianism. The modern High Lutheran and the English High Churchman have as little part in our Reformer as the Romanist. This bull, we may observe, is the classical authority among Romanists for the condemnation of the Saxon Reformer, although, from its date, it embraces only his earliest writings, and but a limited portion of his views.

On the Excommunication of January 1521, Plitt thus remarks :

"When formerly the Vatican assailed, it struck to the ground whoever it aimed at. His previous supporters, even the best, shrunk from him as one afflicted with leprosy, and he was left in solitude. But things are now different. The earliest years of the Reformation period had not passed in vain. There were indeed those who at once avoided all connection with Luther, because his relation of antagonism to the Romish Church was declared by her. Especially elderly people, accustomed fully to the existing state of things, trembled at the consequence of innovations, as they had found in themselves no grounds of spiritual consolation. In many places the bull of excommunication was only made a matter of ridicule ; not only princes, but universities also, and even bishops, ventured upon the delaying at least the publication of it. The great body of the Christian people were now not to be frightened by it, and that, of itself, was a great disaster for Rome. The position which Luther took up and established, that the mystery of iniquity was accomplished in the Papacy, and that the Roman Curia was the seat of the Antichrist, who was to appear before the end of the world, found soon general acceptance. A glance at the popular literature of the immediately succeeding years shews how widely and sarcastically this view was adopted."—(P. 206—8.)

In a note he gives some of the rough and racy popular comments, in prose and verse, on the antagonism of Luther and Leo. The compatriots of the author of "Reineke Fuchs" were not the men to be idle now. The "Lion" of Rome is only, after all, a cat, and, being no longer useful, but mischievous, is condemned, by universal consent, to be hung ! Equally plain-spoken popular comments followed the Ban of the Empire, pronounced at Worms. What a contrast between his position and that of the Bohemian Reformers, condemned a century before at Constance. Then the Teuton was jealous of the Slave, and thus the "Bohemian" became, as his name now signifies in

popular parlance, an outcast. The country of Huss became a crusade theatre for Christian Europe. Now the case seems reversed ; Italy it is that has become isolated. Pope gets from emperor only verbal aid. Luther indeed disappears ; but nobody seriously tries to find out his retreat. His Patmos escapes search or storm, because no one is in earnest to seize him. Constance had shewn the want of value of church-made reforms, and the German people had found out their mistake in giving up the Bohemians to sacrifice.

Plitt does not partake the general opinion that the Wartburg retreat was a place of retirement, where Luther revised and modified various of his previous views. He considers him as only carrying there out his former convictions. To this period belong the commencement of the Kirchen postille and the German New Testament. While shewing how the latter superseded at once all other versions, Plitt makes scarcely any remarks upon the great merits of the translation. Luther's Bible is so thoroughly valued in the fatherland, that to a native of it all encomiums seem superfluous. Alone, of all the Reformers, he has linked his name to the Bible for the people. It has been a succession of versions in other lands, and those associated with no single all-absorbing name.

Plitt has called attention to the coincidence, in the spring of 1521, of the condemnation of Luther by the University of Paris—the centre of mediæval learning, and the appearance of the first systematic development of Protestant doctrine, in the *Loci Communes* of Melancthon. His object in this work was, says Plitt,

“To give an introduction to the right perusal and understanding of the holy Scripture. The points of which he treats, are those which are mainly to be searched for in the word, and which, if understood, give us the full meaning of the sacred volume. But he erred in considering his book as an introduction, and nothing more. It was the manifestation of the full experience of a man born again by the word, and living in daily communion with it. It was no slight testimony to the soundness and purity, as well as power, of the revived life of the Church, that it was so soon able to set forth a theological manual, embodying principles so exact and so clearly developed. Melancthon's book seemed at once to defend the truth from attack, and to keep together the churches founded on that truth in evangelical unity of sentiment.”—(P. 241-2).

He goes on to particularise the effects of the “*Loci*,” in stimulating theological inquiry in various directions among the friends of the Reformation. Thus, directly and indirectly, did Melancthon acquire the honourable title “*Præceptor Germaniæ* !”

Hitherto the course of the Reformation had been even-flow-

ing and pure. But some of its friends began to "walk as men." The first occasion to this was given by the necessity, which the progress of opinion among the people involved, of making outward changes in discipline and worship. Priests began to marry. Convents began to thin. Preaching made men weary of ceremonial. The New Testament, now in every reader's hand, opened men's eyes to the folly of masses, processions, and pilgrimages. A reformed sanctuary was the necessary consequence of a Bible studied. The absence of Luther in his "Patmos," both gave occasion to the hasty activity of Carlstadt and some who outvied even him in hurried efforts of reform, and afforded scope when Luther came back for his moderating the effervescing elements. Some years, however, yet were to elapse before Romish gave fully place to Lutheran worship. The Saxon Reformation was, in this sense, only completed just before the diet at Augsburg.

In a chapter of forty-three pages, one of the most interesting in the volume, Plitt traces the course of the Reformation in the different parts of Germany. He gives the shades as well as the lights—the drawbacks as faithfully as the progress. There was much ignorance still, though the Reformers were doing what neither Romanists nor Humanists had done, bringing education within the reach of the people. Many were quite ready to hate the Romish priesthood—to give them insults or refuse them tithes—who were in no way under the gracious influence of the truth. Many were frequent and applauding hearers of sermons, who laid not to heart the gospel which they heard. Rome had scope enough, if she chose, and she was sure to choose, to single out her basest foes as most distinctively the children of Reform. But the Reformers confessed these evils, mourned over them, and sought to preach them down. Plitt has given a long quotation from Cochläus (p. 301), setting forth the worst side of Reform. It reads like the effusion of a man conscious of no popular gifts, and disbelieving in the efficacy of preaching ability. The pulpit is only scoffed at by those who are incompetent to use it. Could not any one, versed in the fathers, have retorted on these Romish doctors, that the audiences of Ambrose and Augustine, Chrysostom and Bernard, by the confession of these preachers themselves, were too often made up of worldly and unprofited elements? Pre-Lutheran Rome had a pulpit, such as it was. Had it any results, and of what kind?

It is well remarked by Plitt (p. 310), that "the insight into moral depravity became greater in consequence of the Reformation, but not that depravity itself." A greater spiritual insight discovered sin in many previously unsuspected quarters.

With all these drawbacks, however, the cause of God

flourished. Plitt has well brought out in this chapter the diversity of ministerial gifts—the aspects of divine truth in setting forth which each excelled—the greater or smaller measure of spiritual result in different districts, so far as materials are still available. As yet there was a great harmony of spirit—a great brotherliness of tone among almost all the friends of Reform. They rejoiced in one another's successes, they partook in one another's sorrows. When the first martyrs to Protestant truth were burnt at Brussels in July 1523, all Protestant Germany felt the shock. "Praised be God," said Luther, "who has at length begun to display a fruit of ours, or rather his word, and vouchsafe new martyrs to his church. He composed an evangelical *"Salvete Flores Martyrum,"* on the occasion, part of which Plitt quotes. Martyrdom generally gave fresh impulse to the gospel. In this chapter Plitt quotes the first mention of missions among Protestants. Hartmuth v. Cromberg has the honour of first recommending them. The Turks were the best known representatives of heathenism, as lying nearest to Christendom. For their conversion he pleads in a letter to Pope Adrian VI. (p. 325).

Luther was as anxious as Knox for a thorough system of popular education under the care of the State, and permeated by the religious life of the church. No parent was to be allowed to bring up his children in ignorance. "The Reformation is the mother of the generally introduced people's school." Hitherto there had been convent schools, and latterly humanist academies; instruction was now to be the portion of every poor man's child.

From the small beginning of eight hymns, four of them from the Reformer's own pen, issued in 1524, have sprung the myriads of German spiritual songs.*

In a following chapter, on the foundation of evangelical national churches, with especial and minute reference to electoral Saxony, Plitt sets before the reader the great benefits Luther conferred on the church by the issuing of his Larger and Smaller Catechisms. "The Catechism of Luther, the confessedly masterpiece of this kind, soon superseded all others, and became recognised by general consent as the Catechism of the Evangelical Church" (p. 507). These Catechisms appeared in 1529, and even in the following year, in a letter to the elector John, not quoted by Plitt, Luther declares "how his heart rejoiced to see the children of either sex, through the Bible and Catechism instruction, growing up better acquainted

* Kostlin (art. Luther) and Cunz (*Gesch. d. D. Kirchen Liedes*) ascribe eighteen of his hymns to this year. Was there not a second Hymn Book of 1524?

with God and Christ than formerly they would have been through all Romish convents or schools. The young people in the electoral state live in a spiritual paradise, the like of which is not on earth." In Köstlin's article on Luther, in Herzog's Cyclopædia, and in Guericke's Church History, we have details upon Luther's musical labours which Plitt has not given.

Four chapters are devoted by Plitt to the contests of the Evangelical Church with "the Humanist, the Citizen, the Theocratic, and the Swiss Reformation." In the second of these chapters, we could have wished a more exact account of previous risings of the German working classes. There had been four between Luther's birth and his emergence as a reformer. Sir J. Stephen has well put their grievances:—"Domestic slavery, feudal tenures, oppressive taxation, and a systematic denial of justice to the poor, occupied the first place in their catalogue of injuries; the forest laws and the exaction of small tithes the second" (*Ed. Review*, Jan. 1839). We cannot, however, go along with the essayist in his next remark:—"The demand of the right to choose" (and Sir James should have added, to depose) "their own religious teachers may not improbably have been added to give to their cause the semblance of a less sublunary character, and rather in compliment to the spirit of the times, than from any very lively desire for instructors." These people, surely, were as likely to feel spiritual wants as others, and, knowing how church patronage had been abused, was it wonderful they should think popular election a preferable way? Besides, Carlstadt was supposed to be favourable to their views; and might they not suppose a race of ministers, sprung from the people, and feeling with them, as essential to their new state as any secular reform?

The Peasants' War was made use of as an argument against the Reformation; but that it was confined to Germany, and that nowhere else was Protestantism associated with civil war, of the poor upon the rich, proved the mercy of immediately putting it down. Once for all, the mistake was made, and the penalty was borne. After tranquillity was restored, the Protestant districts were honourably distinguished from the Romish ones by the moderation of the punishments inflicted. Where the Reformation had spread furthest, as in Saxony, the appearances of convulsion were least seen.

The suppression by force of the Citizen and the Theocratic Reformation, however a painful necessity of the time, led to evil results. "It was the almost universal opinion that it was the duty of the State, not only to provide for the external place, but for the maintenance of the true doctrine. Even the

evangelical governments drew too readily from this the conclusion, that this duty put a new weapon of authority into their hands ; and there were not wanting short-sighted divines who gave every favour to this as the right way." He instances not a few Anabaptists, not convicted of rebellion, who were punished by imprisonment and even death, and quotes the church ordering of Basle as enjoining the last penalty on relapsed Anabaptists. "Both princes and free cities alike made themselves responsible for the consciences of their subjects ; and if it was complained of that, in Roman Catholic parts, there was no toleration for Protestants, it could be retorted, under Protestant governments there was as little for Romanists. The principles of true toleration, which, without at all sacrificing the truth, can bear with the erring and the weak, were not yet adopted. The victory over error, which the church should have believed in on spiritual grounds, was thus too often made only an external and enforced one ; and, while the church did not withstand the temptation to lean on an arm of flesh, she had afterwards to bear the penalty of her unfaithfulness in having her own liberties trammelled by the same power, which she had invoked for the suppression of error" (p. 416). Ere long the Reformation made use of the censure of books, and the forbidding the importation or sale of erroneous ones. Zwingli complained of this at the hands of Luther.

In his chapter on the opposition of the Saxon and the Swiss Reformations, Plitt goes a little into the doctrinal divergences between Luther and Zwingli. To the personal history and ministerial activity of the latter he gives, for his own special object, a somewhat disproportioned space. A much less favourable impression of the Zürich reformer is left upon the reader than that to be gathered from the *History of the Reformation*, by D'Aubigné. As forcibly, however, as the Swiss historian has shewn, does Plitt bring out the religious independence of Zwingli upon Luther. Plitt's treatment of Zwingli is too empirical. Individual blemishes, such as his over-estimate of Erasmus ; his confused views of faith, as including hope and love, are enumerated, but there is no attempt made to trace them to mental causes in the Swiss reformer's theological system. This has been very ably done by others, and with great compactness of treatment by Güder, in his article on Zwingli in Herzog's *Cyclopædia*. It was the believing union of the soul to God that was Zwingli's centre-point of view ; theology proper, soteriology proper, bulked little with him in comparison of the reality and the consciousness of the believer's restoration to the divine image. Like most of the reformers, he had studied Augustine much, but

the confessions, rather than the great dogmatic treatises, of the bishop of Hippo, seem alone to have been ever assimilated by him.

It is also a defect in this chapter, that while not a few of Zwingle's unseemly expressions about Luther are quoted, of the latter it is merely said, He was accustomed to speak out all his mind (p. 481).

The two remaining chapters of the book are occupied with the occasion and the author of the Augsburg Confession. This production of Melancthon, the earliest of the Protestant declarations of faith, must be viewed in connection with the circumstances of its appearing. Laid before the emperor in presence of the diet, when hope of a national or even of an ecumenical council of trustworthy character has just been laid aside, it is to be considered as Protestantism reduced to a minimum. It is not a system of divine truth, for not a few doctrines of importance are left unnoticed. It is an apostle's creed suited to the sixteenth century and to the wants of Germany. The twenty-one articles, of which it is composed (which have had their influence in forming the thirty-nine articles of the English Church), are neither always logically exclusive one of another, nor drawn up in strict theological language. There is about them somewhat of the looseness of conversation, somewhat, at times, of the iteration of the pulpit. There is quotation of Scripture for some points, and absence of all reference to the word for others as important. The Confession is eminently a transition document; it is evangelical, but incomplete. It is a favourite with many German theologians for its very vagueness; but the half century of contests within the Lutheran Church, between its appearance and the putting forth of the Formula of Concord in 1580, is a practical testimony to the evils that spring from a creed embracing few and thereafter unelaborated points. The (unauthorised) version of it which appeared in 1540 from the pen of Melancthon, and which is generally passed over in silence by church historians, is larger, by more than two-thirds, than its predecessor, and, with the exception of the tenth article, which plainly teaches consubstantiation, the additions and alterations are generally for the better. It is still, however, an essentially popular and untheological document. A confession which omits all mention or imputed righteousness, cannot be accepted by us as fully evangelical. Setting aside some distinctive Lutheran views, the Formula of Concord is as much superior in theological weight to the Confession, as the Westminster Confession is to the Thirty-nine Articles. The reason was the same; half a century in Germany, eighty years in England, had shewn how, if you wished one definite faith throughout the church, you must enlarge your theological basis, you must sharply define your

theological terms. In this we are not condemning the earlier, we are pronouncing more informed and more wary the later theologians.

Our remarks and our extracts will, we trust, have given our readers a fair review of this important and interesting volume. Plitt might perhaps have improved his book by abridging his reflections, by giving more of the secular history of Germany in its bearing on the Reformation ; by affording us a few glimpses of the great reformer in his epistolary intercourse as a friend ; and by presenting somewhat of the better aspects of Romanism. Persecution, ignorance, worldliness, surely these did not then exhaust the catalogue of the qualities possessed by the adherents of Rome.

The notes, of which there are a great many, give a variety of interesting and characteristic extracts from both the theological and the popular literature of the day. From all parts of Germany proof is thus accumulated, how thoroughly reform was the question of the day, Luther the man of the time. Round him, for or against, all literature gathers. But with all our veneration for the German reformer, we miss in him the thorough perception of the principles on which a Church should be founded. It is expediency, Christian no doubt, that seems to determine what is to be removed, and what left in the church. The word is not fully consulted here. It was left for others, after him, to make good his deficiencies here.

ART. IX.—*Page's "Man : Where, Whence, and Whither ?"*

Man : Where, Whence, and Whither ? Being a Glance at Man in his Natural History Relations. By DAVID PAGE, LL.D., F.R.S.E., F.G.S., Author of “*Past and Present Life of the Globe*,” “*Philosophy of Geology*,” “*Geology for General Readers*,” &c. &c. Edinburgh : Edmonston and Douglas. 1867.

THE work to which we devote this article is not of large size, but it demands attention, both on account of the importance of its subject and the reputation of its author. It is a volume of not quite two hundred pages, an expansion of two lectures delivered last year before the members of the Philosophical Institution in Edinburgh. Dr Page assigns as a reason for its publication, the opposition which his views met with when propounded in his lectures,—an opposition which he characterizes as, on the part of some, “vehement and unreason-

enlarge your theological basis, you must sharply define your ing,' and which he alleges to have been accompanied, "either ignorantly or intentionally," with misrepresentation. In justice both to himself and his subject, therefore, he tells us that he has been constrained to publish this work, and so to seek for his views "a wider, and he trusts also, a fairer consideration." Of what misrepresentations he complains, he gives us no hint.

Dr Page has a very high and well-earned reputation as a geologist, and some of his works on geology are among the best that can be put into the hands of a student. He has come before the public, however, also, as an anthropologist, and in the present work he appears rather in the latter character than in the former, geology being introduced only as subservient to anthropology. That his views meet with opposition, can hardly be regarded by himself as wonderful,—contrary, as he is evidently aware that they are, to prevalent opinions and beliefs. Let us endeavour to examine them carefully, and to consider what he says in their behalf.

Entering, however, upon the wide field of science, over which the anthropologist claims the right to range, Dr Page is far from shewing himself so much at home everywhere as in his own particular field of geology. When we depart from strictly geological subjects, we soon feel that we cannot follow him with perfect confidence, even in his statement of scientific facts. Facts become commingled with theory or hypothesis, until it often seems as if the distinction between the one and the other had been forgotten. Dr Page's book is far from being rich in scientific facts, and in this we have been disappointed; for, on beginning the perusal of it, we expected to find it somewhat like Darwin's work on the Unity of Species,—a work abounding in facts and in arguments based upon them; the facts extremely interesting, and admirably exhibited in relation to the hypothesis which the author seeks to maintain, whatever may be thought of the arguments by which he maintains it. As Dr Page does not think it necessary to bring forward a great array of facts, so neither does he make much show of arguments. He speaks, indeed, again and again, of being "logical," and plainly intimates his opinion that his opponents are far from being so; but he seems not to know what close reasoning is, and makes assertions of the most questionable character, enforced by such a phrase as *It must be*, or such an adverb as *clearly*. Thus in his chapter on Man in his Ethnological Relations, he says, concerning the differences of the races of men, "These differences, when interpreted in the light of progression, have clearly reference to time, to periods during which the higher succeeded the lower, and the lower that which stands next beneath it." This is merely to take for granted

that which ought to be proved ; and indeed Dr Page's whole system is here taken for granted at once ; and there are many instances of the same kind throughout the work. The development hypothesis is assumed as true, and everything is accommodated to it. Again and again, it is made to serve the purpose of argument in favour of itself, or of those things which are adduced only in order to maintain it. Reasoning in a circle is the ordinary process of argument throughout the work.

The inaccuracy of Dr Page's reasoning may be strikingly illustrated by quoting one of what he calls his *Propositions*. They are formally introduced to notice even in the table of contents, and each chapter, except the introductory and concluding chapters, ends with a *proposition*, "Our *first* proposition," "Our *second* proposition," &c. Here surely we might expect to find definite statement, a conclusion derived from argument, and to be founded upon in argument again. We find instead mere summaries of the views and arguments of the chapters. Let us take, for example, the *fourth* proposition. It concludes the chapter on Man in his Functional Relations.

"Looking, therefore, at man in his functional relations, our *fourth* proposition is, that, like other animals, he has certain duties to perform purely of a physical nature, and which are rendered imperative by the requirements of existence. In virtue, however, of his higher organisation and intellect, he can, within certain limits, subjugate and adapt the forces of nature, and thus acquire a mastery over obstacles which no other animal can, and this mastery will be in direct proportion to his intelligence and cultivation. And further, that while other animals but slowly and within restricted limits affect the distribution of plants and other animals, man becomes a modifier and subcreator, as it were,—here extirpating and transferring, there cultivating and disseminating, according to the natural capacity or inaptitude of the inferior races for civilisation and advancement. We say *civilising and extirpating*, for there can be no domestication of man as there is domestication of the lower animals. To domesticate is to enslave, and nature has never yet permitted the institution of permanent enslavement, as it has provided for and fostered that of permanent domestication. And, finally, that these functional relations are in accordance with a great law of natural progression, by which the development of newer and higher races shall ever be coincident with the extinction of the earlier and inferior."—(Pp. 100–101.)

Is this a proposition ? We would not stickle about the mere term, but it is too evident that the employment of it here is indicative of inaccurate thought, and loose, careless argument.

In his introductory chapter, and in the very first paragraph

of it, Dr Page complains that the subject of the origin and antiquity of man, is "furtively studied" and "unfairly dealt with," and for this he accounts by saying that, "impressed with certain theological notions, a large section of inquirers approach the investigation with restraint and distrust." He seems to have a great dread of theological notions, and traditional beliefs. He avails himself of every opportunity of exclaiming against them. The ordinary severity of his style changes into bitterness when he comes in contact with them, although he touches them only, as it were, in passing, and without seeming particularly to inquire what they are,—far less, on what they are founded. Dr Page makes frequent reference to his own honesty and earnestness as an inquirer after truth, a reference which an honest and earnest inquirer scarcely needs in any circumstances to make. Far less does he need to insinuate that there is a want of honesty and earnestness in his opponents. This, however, appears to be Dr Page's notion. And he plainly asserts, in his introductory chapter, that "no man who has subscribed to creeds and formulas, whether in theology or in philosophy, can be an unbiassed investigator of the truth, or an unprejudiced judge of the opinions of others." We need not enter here into any argument about creeds. The question, as stated by Dr Page, evidently relates, not merely to theological creeds, but to any definite system of opinions received as true. What then? Are men never to adopt opinions, or having adopted them, are they and their opinions at once to be thrown out of account, when opposite opinions are advanced? Is there in this anything like common sense? Let an opinion be adopted on apparant evidence, surely the man who holds it is not to be set aside, by him who puts forth an opposite opinion, as unworthy to take part in the discussion of the subject. Dr Page's own book is an instance of a work devoted to the advocacy of a particular system or hypothesis. There is nothing he can say against those who have declared their adherence to any confession of faith, that might not fairly be retorted against himself. But he falls into a paroxysm of rage against the adherents of creeds, or at least of theological creeds. "The holiest beliefs," he says, "are those founded on informed reason; all besides is little better than superstition and mechanical formality. It is of no use, then, when new questions like the present are mooted, for certain minds to work themselves into a frenzy of "orthodoxy"—to savagely smear themselves with theological war-paint, and raise the old war-whoop of the Bible in danger." These sentences shew the attitude in which Dr Page meets his opponents, and afford a specimen of the amenities with which he diversifies the general uniform placidity of his style.

The three parts of which this book consists are indicated in the title, *Man's Where, Whence, and Whither*. Under the first of these heads, Dr Page considers man in his zoological relations, his geographical relations, his ethnological relations, and his functional relations ; under the second, in his historical relations, his geological relations, and his genetic relations ; under the third, in what he calls his progressive relations. To follow him from chapter to chapter is probably the best way of dealing with his book.

In his chapter on the Zoological Relations of Man, he insists strongly on the structural affinities between man and the lower animals, and on the other things which man has in common with them, as life, growth, reproduction, and decay—liability to thirst and hunger, heat and cold, pain and pleasure, and to the influences of air, light, heat, &c. “As a mere animal, then,” he says, “man, like other animals, has his place in nature. It may be higher, but this is difference in degree, not difference in kind” (p. 36). It is easy to see what wide diversities of meaning may be attached to this expression, “difference in degree, and not difference in kind.” As to all the things noticed, it may, however, fairly be questioned, if there is even difference of degree. Man's higher place in nature does not depend upon any of them. There is no need to suppose that man's relations to external nature, in respect of his mere animal existence, are higher than those of an ox, or in any way essentially different from them. The introduction of this notion of difference in degree, but not in kind, here serves only to raise a cloud, under which further argument may be conducted. On the ground, that “the essentials are the same to man as to other living beings,” Dr Page objects strongly to the conduct of those zoologists who, “influenced by preconceptions as to man's origin and destiny,” would assign to the human species “a place apart, and altogether of its own kind.” The meaning of this is obvious. But the question remains, Are there no differences between man and other living beings, which shew him to be entitled to a place apart, all points of agreement or resemblance having been considered ?

We are told of a great structural plan on which the whole vital world has been framed, so that man must merely be regarded as one of the multitude of living beings, the highest, no doubt, but not essentially different from the rest. “Zoologically, indeed, it would not be difficult,” Dr Page says, “to shew that the radiate is but a permanent development of the temporary functional form of the globular ; the articulate of the radiate ; the molluscan a more concentrated expression of all three ; and the vertebrate a higher specialisation of the molluscan ; while each section is linked to the other by inter-

mediate forms, which are either still existing, or belong to by-gone geological periods." All this is set forth confidently, as if there could be no doubt about it, yet there is much here which is very doubtful, and more than doubtful. The relation of the radiate form to the globular remains to be proved; likewise that of the articulate to the radiate. Dr Page states the relation of the molluscan to the other three, and of the vertebrate to the molluscan in what may be called poetical rather than philosophical or scientific language. And it is not true that intermediate forms can be traced either in still existing species, or in fossil remains. The differences still appear wide and distinct, when all nature is examined. Yet if they did not, it would not much affect the question as to man's place in nature.

How completely Dr Page proceeds upon a preconceived theory, may be seen from such sentences as the following:—

"Comparing the various orders and families of the vertebrate class, the lower with the higher, and the higher with those next above them, it seems that *adaptive modifications*, rather than independent and repeated creations, have been the governing method in structural advancement.—(P. 41.)

"Difference in form and function does not necessarily imply a separate origin; and, seeing the gradual shading of form into form in nature, it is easier, and indeed more rational, to believe in modification of original type-forms, than in the creation of new forms for every slight variation in habits and mode of life which the physical forces of the universe are ever producing. As external conditions are ever changing under the operation of physical forces, and this in conformity to established laws, so we may rest assured that variations in life-forms are equally the orderly results of secondary causation, though we may not, in the present state of knowledge, be able to indicate either the time when, or the mode in which, such causation may operate."—(Pp. 43, 44.)

Who can fail to perceive here that, under cover of such expressions as "it seems," "it is easier, and indeed more rational, to believe," and "we may rest assured," a whole system is taken for granted, which ought to have been established by proof, and is not, only because proof cannot be adduced? "Variation takes place so slowly," Dr Page says, "and by stages so minute, that ages may pass before it rises into what we are in the habit of calling 'specific' distinctions; and even where it may have culminated in species, observation has been so recent and so imperfect, that if no argument can be drawn from this source in favour of the doctrine of development, none, on the other hand, can be honestly advanced against it"—(Pp. 44, 45.) How, then, it is more rational to accept that doctrine than to reject it, we utterly fail to see. Of the arguments against it no notice is taken. Dr Page is, of course,

perfectly aware, although he gives no hint of it, that it has been rejected by men of the highest eminence in science, as inconsistent with ascertained facts. However, he thinks it more easy to suppose the creation of a monad than the creation of a man. “Should it be advanced,” he says, “as is sometimes done, that the creation of a monad is as incomprehensible as that of a man, then to this we decidedly answer, No.” But why? To us there appears to be gross irreverence in thus pronouncing that one act of creation is more comprehensible than another. In contemplating the creation of an animated being, we must, moreover, think not only of structure or organisation, but of the communication of life—a thing entirely beyond our comprehension, and beyond all bounds of reasonable conjecture. In the “*Vestiges of the Natural History of Creation*,” it is suggested that animal life may perhaps have originated in some movement of physical elements, under the influence of light, heat, electricity, and the like. Of this notion there is nothing in the work now before us. Yet it seems to carry out the theory of development more consistently, than a scheme which regards the creation of monads as probable, and that of the most highly organised and most highly endowed creature as improbable. If it could be proved that life begins through the mere action of the forces of inanimate nature, then, indeed, it might reasonably be supposed that it has made progress from the monad up to man.

Dr Page makes no bold and strong assertion such as may readily be found in the pages of the *Anthropological Review*, that science *disowns miracle*.* But he tells us, in his preface, that his wish is “to contribute his mite to that modern movement of mind which seeks to substitute inquiry for dogmatism, comprehensible methods for miracles, and rational convictions for traditional beliefs.” We would not strain these words beyond their certain meaning; but there is much to the same effect throughout the work, and the general tendency of all is adverse to the notion of miracle. Yet creation is a miracle, and Dr Page often speaks of creation and of a Creator.

In his chapter on man’s zoological relations, Dr Page dwells not a little on the correspondence between the lower animals and man, in [their mental or intellectual faculties, regarding the difference as one of degree rather than of kind. That the lower animals possess in some degree intellectual faculties similar to those of man, we are no more inclined to dispute than the general correspondence of organisation, especially in the vertebrate tribes. But the question of essential difference still remains. On this point, Dr Page expresses himself very

* See the *Anthropological Review* for July and October 1867, the first article.

decidedly. "The main difference," he says, "seems to be that the intellectual principle in the lower animals soon reaches its climax, and remains stationary, while in man it is ever improvable and progressive,—improvable in the individual, and progressive in the race" (Pp. 50, 51). Again, "This inferiority of intellectual adaptation, which soon reaches its climax in the lower animals, limits the improvability of the individual, and prevents progression in the race; whereas the superior adaptation of man secures, under favourable conditions, at once the improvement of the individual, and the progress of the race" (p. 55). But whence this difference? Is it to be ascribed to mere adaptation? And does adaptation arise in the course of development? Or is there a creative power exercised? These are questions to which we find no answer in Dr Page's work.

The chapter on Man's Geographical Relations, the second of those devoted to man's *Where*, presents less that demands our notice than that on his zoological relations. Dr Page insists much on the influence of physical conditions, and particularly those of climate, as affecting the human race. He perhaps exaggerates a little the effects of climate on man. "Under the tropics," he says, "where warmth and the means of subsistence are easily procured, he is chiefly a vegetable feeder, improvident and little progressive; under temperate latitudes, where the means of subsistence are procured with greater difficulty, and seasonal changes have to be studied, he is partly a vegetable and partly an animal feeder, more industrious, provident, and progressive; while, within the polar regions, where warmth has to be sustained by diet, and where his whole time is spent in securing a precarious subsistence, he is solely an animal feeder, toilsome but stationary." From the present we are referred to the past, to the probable condition of man during the glacial epoch in Europe. We are told, however, also, of the difference between one people and another, why "one people continues indolent and unprogressive, while another exhibits incessant activity and progress," and "one nation is lively, gay, and fickle, and another serious, sober, and steadfast." Is the difference between the Frenchman and Spaniard, then, or that between the Englishman and the Frenchman, or between the inhabitants of different parts of Britain, Saxon and Gael, to be ascribed merely to geographic conditions? Dr Page insists strongly upon the effect of geographic conditions. "What but the influence of new conditions," he says, "that has developed the Yankee form, features, and habit, from the Anglo-Saxon stock of western Europe? and what but the same cause that within three or four generations has begun to stamp new features on the British Australian? What but the dif-

ferent geographical position that evolved the Welsh, the Scotch, and the Irish Celt, from the original Celtic stock of the east ? and what but the same power, acting throughout all ages, and concomitantly with the principle of *ascensive development in time*, that has stamped the still broader characteristics of Caucasian, Mongolian, and Malay ? ” And now, let us ask, what is all this but mere assumption, supported by no evidence whatever ? As to the principle of *ascensive development in time*, to which Dr Page assigns the first place, “for it must never be forgotten,” he says, “that external conditions are but secondary factors, and that there is a higher law overruling the distribution of life in time than that which determines its distribution in space,” this also, in so far as man is concerned, is a mere assumption without proof.

The third chapter is devoted to man’s Ethnological Relations. Here we are told that there is a wider difference between what are called *varieties* of man, than between many of the so-called *species* of lower animals. “It may fairly be questioned,” Dr Page says, “whether what are now called varieties, would not have been regarded as distinct *species*, had zoologists had the courage to apply to man the same methods of differentiation that they are in the habit of applying to other animals.” He goes on to say, “In many instances the so-called specific distinctions in zoology are founded on colour, covering, and other features often less marked than the corresponding characteristics in man ; and yet men are arranged in *varieties* merely, while these lower animals are separated into *species*. Strip these “species” of their colours and covering, and the skeleton of the one could not be distinguished from that of the other ; but place the skeleton of the African negro beside that of the European white, and a child might detect the difference.” Dr Page is certainly aware that, in determining the question of identity of *species*, all evidence has to be taken into account, and that there is other evidence with regard to man than with regard to the *species* of the lower animals. He must be aware also, that many *species* of animals have only been provisionally distinguished and named, for mere convenience, whilst the question of specific difference is open to further investigation. If many of the present groups or *genera* should be reduced to one *species*—as seems not improbable in regard to some of them—it would not materially affect the great question at issue. There is, however, an extreme exaggeration in the statement that *species* are constituted on mere distinctions of colours and covering. The only plausible ground for such a statement, with regard to vertebrate animals, is to be found in some of the *species* of certain families of birds—particularly of the *Falconidæ*—which have been described by some naturalists

as distinct, although the characters are only those of plumage, and really distinguish only sex and age. But as this has become known, the imagined species have been brought into their proper place, which every naturalist recognises. Amongst the species really regarded as distinct, throughout the whole class of vertebrate animals, it may confidently be affirmed that there is a marked difference of skeleton, so that they may easily be distinguished by the skeleton alone. As to mere colours and covering, these are well known to be among the most variable of characters; and even in plants, colours are little regarded as grounds of specific distinction.

Dr Page maintains the unity of the human species, but it is in subordination to his theory of developmental descent from inferior forms, which he says is "much more probable and far more intelligible" than the idea of an independent origin of different races. Of the degrees of probability and intelligibility, we find ourselves incapable of judging. We look for evidence, and Dr Page presents us with none. We have his theory instead. "As the minor differences are mainly owing to geographical relations, so we may ascribe the major distinctions to a similar causation acting through indefinite periods; and thus we may trace all the varieties,—European, Mongolian, Negro, &c.,—as divergences from earlier varieties, and ultimately from one original source." But why, if man has sprung from some being of lower organisation, may not the same thing have taken place in a number of instances at the same time, or at different times, and perhaps in different parts of the world? We are at a loss to see how, on Dr Page's principles, the unity of the human species can be maintained. Taking it for granted, however, he proceeds to say, that "reasoning from what we know of the existing varieties of mankind, and the tribes and nationalities embraced by these varieties, it may be logically inferred that the Caucasian or white man has been preceded by the Mongol, Red Indian, and Malay, and that these in turn were preceded by the Ethiopian or Negro. As the white men of the American states are the immediate descendants of the nations of Western Europe, and as these nations were in turn descended from more oriental stocks, so clearly must the great varieties have been descended from each other,—the later from the earlier, the higher from the lower, and the lower from those next beneath them." It is impossible not to observe what service the words "logically" and "clearly" perform in these sentences. The argument is nought, but these two words give it a semblance of value. Let us take them as mere expletives, and we may still safely deny our descent from Malays, Red Indians, Mongols, and Ethiopians or Negroes, a pedigree which we are not desirous to claim.

Man's lowly origin is assumed by Dr Page as certain. "Whatever his origin, man's first condition," he says, "as well as that of his immediate descendants, must have been of a lowly and primitive nature, with everything to acquire, and no accumulated experience to assist. Even the source from which those who hold a contrary opinion profess to derive their beliefs,"—thus it is that Dr Page adverts to the Bible,—“refers in the plainest language to men covering themselves with leaves and skins, subsisting on fruits and flocks, sheltering themselves in caves and tents, prone to disobedience, guilty of fratricide, and in no ways differing in condition, physically or mentally, from the rudest races of the present day.” Dr Page admits, however, that “of any varieties lower in point of organisation than the lowest of the present day, we have no unquestioned geological evidence.” When he deals with the ascertained facts of geology, we always feel that we can follow him with perfect confidence; he exhibits the caution proper to a man of science. Yet even here, he passes off into theory and fanciful conjecture. Not contented with indicating the possibility that remains of tribes lower than the lowest that now exist, may perhaps yet be found in Asia or Africa, he goes on to say, that “not till these regions have been fully explored, can we do more than merely admit the existence of extinct varieties as a logical inference from what we already know of the creational law of continuity and progress.” A logical inference, indeed! An inference from a law, which in all its relation to this subject, is itself a mere assumption.

The next chapter, and the last under the head of *Man's Where*, treats of Man in his Functional Relations. Like other creatures, he “has certain functions or duties which he is necessitated to perform.” Some of these arise from “his superior organisation and intellectual endowments, which are peculiar to himself.” Unlike other creatures, he is a “tool and implement-maker, a fire-kindler and machine-inventor.” But this is not all. He is also “an inventor of intellectual tools,—of political, social, and religious schemes, by which he at once promotes his own comfort, and secures the improvement of his successors.” There is no exception made here, no thought admitted of any religion made known to man by revelation. Nor throughout this book, is such an idea even for a moment glanced at. All religions are placed in one category, as products of the mind of man.

A distinction is made, however, between man and the lower animals, in the power of adaptation which man possesses, and this power is said to mark in an especial manner the progressive from the declining races of mankind; “and we may safely hold it,” Dr Page says, “as a matter of faith, that according to

the possession of this power are certain races destined to advance, and others as certainly doomed to extirpation." But why should we hold it as a matter of faith? There is no certain evidence for it, and we object to receive as matter of faith, that which cannot be proved by sufficient evidence. That some of the inferior races of human beings have disappeared as the superior races occupied the countries which they formerly inhabited, is unquestionably true; but it does not follow that there is a law of nature dooming the inferior races to extirpation. The disappearance of the Indians from North America, and of the aborigines from Australia, has not been altogether to the credit of the white man; and without further proof, we would be sorry to assume it as the result of a law of nature. Dr Page, however, is perfectly sure of it. "In this way, and under the rapid advancement of the white man, melt away the Red Indian from America, the Bushman and Hottentot from South Africa, and the Aborigines from Tasmania and Australia. Such appears to be, and such seems ever to have been, the course and order of nature." There must be an extinction of the inferior, and a rise and spread of the higher varieties. "It is in vain to talk, as some well-meaning but sadly-misinformed men do, of the civilising and ameliorating influences of admixture and amalgamation." And here Dr Page quotes from an American writer, Mr Squier, evidently full of the prejudices of race, by whom we are told that it is a natural instinct which prevents the commixture of widely separated human families, and that when this natural instinct is disregarded, the result is deplorable, as "the offspring of such combinations or amalgamations are not only deficient in physical constitution, in intellect, and in moral restraint, but to a degree which often contrasts unfavourably with any of the original stocks." Reference is made to the anarchical states of Spanish America for proof. It might be worthy of consideration if no other causes than the mixture of races could be assigned for the anarchy of Spanish America. That a mixed race is inferior to any of the original stocks, will not readily be admitted by one who compares a mulatto with a negro, or a Canadian half-breed with a Red Indian.

The consequences of Dr Page's opinion as to the wide difference between the races of man are important, and are clearly stated by himself. Missionary enterprise among the lower races is vain. "There can be no greater delusion, therefore, as regards man's functional relations, than the expectation that either individuals or nations will ever be brought to the same beliefs, or to one common course of action" (p. 99). The *therefore* refers to nothing that has any connection with the

subject ; but the mind of the author clearly enough appears in the sentence which we have quoted.

So much of man's *Where*. In the part of the work relating to his *Whence*, the first chapter treats of his historical relations. "We must appeal to history in the first place," Dr Page says, "and where history fails us, we must turn to the record preserved in the earth's rock-formations, and which geology is striving to interpret." The appeal to history, however, is found unsatisfactory. To say nothing of the prejudices in the way, "arising from early and widely accepted beliefs," which Dr Page seems very desirous to remove, we are distinctly told that the response of history "must necessarily be faint and unintelligible," for "all tradition on the subject" of the antiquity and origin of man "is vague and unreliable ; all written history is recent, partial, and uncertain." There is no exception made in favour of an inspired record ; the Mosaic narrative is set out of account along with all the myths and traditions of ancient nations, allusion is evidently made to it as influencing beliefs and prejudices, to which of course the philosophic mind is to rise superior. Dr Page acknowledges that no reliance can be placed on the chronologies of the Chinese and Hindoos, nor on the astronomical record of the Chaldees, which, although carrying us backward in time some three or four hundred thousand years, "seems incapable of verification by modern astronomers," a mild way of stating its utter falsehood. Dr Page is unwilling, however, to forego the advantage of such a testimony to the antiquity of man. "We can only receive it," he says, "as a vague corroboration of the high antiquity of the human race in the region to which it refers." But why should we receive it at all ? If received, it is more than a vague corroboration ; if rejected, as it must be, it goes for nothing whatever. Dr Page clings with lingering fondness to the oriental time-records. "We cannot help remarking," he says, "that these time-records, wide and uncertain as they are, seem more in accordance with the vastitude of time implied by the geological relations of human remains, than other chronologies more frequently appealed to" (Pp. 108, 109). We are at no loss to know what is meant by the contemptuous expression, "other chronologies more frequently appealed to." Dr Page directs attention to the different interpretations and calculations of the Scripture chronology, and concludes that "a record admitting of such wide interpretations by scholars equally learned and earnest, is clearly one upon which science cannot base her conclusions." But this is not all. He asserts that "even if there were no discrepancies in interpretation, and no doubt as to the order of Hebrew descent, it is evident that no record can carry us back to the beginnings of mankind—to those far-back stages of primeval life,

during which language itself can do little more than express the necessities of animal existence." What is this but to assert that there is no such thing as revelation, at least regarding the origin of mankind? It is evidently set aside, as not worthy of consideration. Dr Page is confident as to "the unavoidable course of human progress,—its earliest stages utterly lost in the forgetfulness of barbarism, the middle stages distorted and clouded by myths and fables, and only the latest assuming the orderly sequence and reliability of history." "It is vain," he says, "to look for any chronology before man learned to record; hopeless to expect anything like certainty from the tales and undated memories of tradition." It does not seem even to occur to him that there may be such a thing as revelation.

Looking to written history, he finds all over southern Asia and southern Europe "different phases of civilisation, different languages, different styles of architecture, and different forms of religious worship, all of which must have taken thousands of years for their elaboration," and he thinks that a little reflection on this is all that is necessary to expose the absurdity of a chronology that would limit the existence of man to the lapse of a few thousand years." It is not necessary that we should be particular about a few thousand years more or less; let us leave the chronology unsettled, but what shall we say about the growth of nationalities, languages, and religions? As Dr Page puts his argument, the diversities of religion occupy a chief place. What, then, is the fact regarding these? Did Christianity come into existence by a slow evolution from something antecedent? Did Mahomedanism spring up slowly, as a plant grows from the earth? Did Buddhism thus evolve itself from previously existing systems? And, within our own day, what shall we say of the rapid and monstrous growth of Mormonism? It is manifest that changes of religion cannot afford evidence of great periods of time. Man, according to Dr Page, is "an inventor of intellectual tools—of social, political, and religious schemes, by which he secures his safety and progress," and hence he infers the long duration of the race. It is to be observed that the invention of religious schemes is ascribed to man himself, and no exception is made. The idea of a religious scheme given by God is not for a moment admitted.

In the chapter on Man's Geological Relations, we find little that demands notice. Dr Page here exhibits the caution of a man of science, as far as geology is concerned; and whatever may be thought of his argument, he rests it on nothing but facts well substantiated. He tells us of the "sculptured monoliths, sepulchral barrows, and lake-dwellings," which give evidence of the use of iron and bronze, and of the more early "shell-mounds (savage-feasting relics), cave-dwellings, lake-

silts, and river-drifts, in which all the implements are of the rudest description.” From all this he infers the great antiquity of man in western Europe. But this does not satisfy him. For, “high as may be the antiquity of man in Europe, it cannot be set down as the limit of his existence in Asia and other regions.” Thus we are referred from a region of conjecture, somewhat limited, to a region of conjecture utterly unlimited, and to a time when, “while the men of western Europe were fashioning flint implements, and combating the difficulties of their situation, earlier races may have been enjoying the amenities of a comparatively advanced civilisation in southern Asia.” It is mere conjecture on which a theory is here based ; and what better is it when we are told, that “we must carry the argument of ascensive development still further, and believe that, as the men of Europe were descended from those of Asia, so the Indo-European variety of our race was preceded by the inferior varieties,—Mongolian or Negritian,—in the order of their physical and intellectual advancement.” But why must we believe it ? As formerly, no reason is assigned. It is a theory unsupported by evidence. Dr Page has here departed from geology, and ventured upon other ground, on which he treads rashly, making assertions which have only the development hypothesis to support them, and which are made to assume the appearance of facts meant to support it.

The chapter on Man’s Genetic Relations begins with a notice of the cosmogonies of different nations, the last mentioned being the Hebrew cosmogony, of which we are told that, “according to the second version of the Hebrew Genesis, Adam, the man (by some commentators said to signify ‘red earth’), is formed out of the dust of the ground, and Eve, the woman, is fashioned from a rib taken out of the side of Adam ; while, according to the first version, man is simply said to have been created on the sixth day,—male and female, and in the image of his Maker.” We need not stay to inquire into the alleged discrepancy of what Dr Page calls the two versions of the Hebrew Genesis. No one, not anxious to find the discrepancy, would have found it ; and, although Dr Page is not the first, but has merely accepted it as indicated by others, this is of no consequence. We need hardly allude to the place assigned to the Hebrew cosmogony, as the last of a list which begins with that of the African negro. The conclusion is of more importance. “But however curious the fable, or mysterious the myth,”—the narrative or narratives of the book of Genesis being here again put upon a level with all the heathen fables,—“none of them is of the least avail in science, and reason is driven, in the long run, either to abide by the belief

in a direct creative act, or to seek for the solution of the problem in the theory of derivative descent." The theory of derivative descent, it must be remarked, implies either a direct creative act at its commencement, or an evolution of organic from inorganic nature. Of this Dr Page takes no notice, but he urges that "a gradual ascent in time from lower to higher forms of life has been clearly established," and that, "as science has no evidence of other than the operation of secondary forces in nature, so it seeks to ascribe this ascent to this kind of causation." Science seeks to exhibit truth, or to discover truth. Dr Page makes it to seek the confirmation of a theory.

How completely he assumes the development hypothesis, will appear from the following sentence:—"If, then, the principle of adaptive modification be admitted, no matter how infinitesimal the variations may be within a given time, it must, in the long run, be capable of producing the most extensive results, and what are now regarded as varieties may pass into species, and species in process of time assume the rank of generic distinctions." Here we have the mere show of argument, and not the reality. To say nothing of the uncertainty regarding varieties, species, and genera, any change of opinion concerning which would in no way affect the case, why should we admit an unlimited adaptive modification? That there is an adaptive modification, no one doubts; but the question of its extent is quite distinct from that of its reality. We know that the *Brassica oleracea* of our shores has been developed into kale, cabbage, cauliflower, and many other forms; but these all tend to return to the original form; and there is as yet no proof of its development into a turnip, a wall-flower, or a stock—forms so cognate that we name them rather than roses, honeysuckle, and other common plants of our gardens. Species seem to have limits, and the possibility of unlimited development, by natural selection or otherwise, is as far from being proved as it was when the development hypothesis was first heard of. Dr Page himself admits that it is not established by proof. He tells us, indeed, that its advocates "seek to establish it as the only comprehensible process by which the Creator has chosen to people this earth, at the several stages of its existence, with newer, higher, and ever-varying life-forms." We reject as utterly worthless all arguments about a comprehensible process of creation. But we listen with respect to Dr Page when he frankly declares, as a geologist, that "geology has not yet discovered the connecting links, as it were, between man and the lower animals, no form or forms that can be said to stand intermediate between the lower grades of humanity and the highest known forms of quadrumana. It may be

argued,” he proceeds, “as is sometimes done, that the difference between the lowest men and the highest quadrumana is not so wide as that between the highest civilised man and the lowest savage. Still narrow as the gulf may be, science has yet no indication of any intermediate form to bridge it over, no trace of a higher quadrumane, none of a lower man than stone-fashioning, cave-dwelling savages.”—(Pp. 150, 151.) It is melancholy after this to find him pleading for the expectation that the gulf may yet be bridged over, by further geological research in Asia and Africa, the regions of the anthropoid quadrumana, and endeavouring to persuade himself and his readers that “the development theory, as applicable to the human race, is not necessarily degrading.” His argument on this point is very remarkable. Whatever man’s origin, he says, man springs from inorganic elements, and partakes of the same animal nature with other creatures. “All that ennobles him above other creatures belongs truly to the soul and intellect.” He finds a specialty in man, in the power of indefinite improvement which he possesses. But whence is this specialty derived? Does not the origination of it imply an exercise of creative power, as much as the formation of the body itself? Or if a descent of man from some of the quadrumana is to be maintained, how is the great change to be accounted for, from a nature incapable of improvement to one capable of improvement which has no assignable limits? There can be nothing more monstrous than the idea of an ape-mother holding in her arms the first possessor of this glorious capacity, the first of mankind. Dr Page objects to “the jibing and jeering at the idea of an ‘ape-ancestry,’ so often resorted to,” he says, “by the ignorant,” but which, he assures us, “has in reality no significance to the mind of the philosophic naturalist.”—(Pp. 155, 156.) We leave the members of the Anthropological Society to enjoy the idea of their ape-ancestry, and of their descent from a more remote ancestry of snails or worms. To us it seems to be an idea which it is a degradation of the human mind to entertain, a vile abuse of man’s noblest powers to advocate.

Having now followed Dr Page through his chapters on Man’s *Where* and *Whence*, we do not care to go further, and to bestow equal attention on what he says on Man’s *Whither*. It is the future of the race, we must observe, and not at all the future of the individual, that is the subject of the chapter on the progressive relations of man. Improvement still more and more rapid is held forth in prospect for the human race. We are told of an upward and onward development, of which “art and science, literature and philosophy, ethics and religion, have all alike partaken ;” and Dr Page asks, “Shall

we cease to have faith in their future ascension?" We too believe in a future improvement and glorious progress of mankind, but it is not based on a theory for which the proof is still confessedly to be sought, and which assigns to us a genetic connection with brutes. With our expectations concerning the future of the human race upon earth are also associated hopes concerning ourselves personally, on which subject anthropologists in general are strangely silent.

We have only a few concluding remarks to make, and they concern the relation of the Development Hypothesis with our religious beliefs. Is that hypothesis, we must ask, consistent with Christianity? If Christianity itself is a mere product of the human mind, how is its truth to be maintained, and in particular the truth of the most essential parts of the whole system? Again, if we assume an ascensive development, by which man has sprung from a lowly origin, what becomes of the doctrine of the fall, and what then of the scheme of redemption? And how, in connection with belief in a genetic descent of man from quadrumana and other inferior animals, can we maintain the doctrine of the incarnation of the Son of God? There is something very shocking in the juxtaposition of the two ideas; but they must be contemplated together. We are told that science has again and again triumphed already over opposition made to it on the ground of a supposed antagonism to religion; but it was only a supposed antagonism that existed, and Christianity has lost nothing by the progress of astronomy and geology. The fancies of anthropologists, unsupported as they are by evidence, are not to be classed with the discoveries of science; and it is fair to ask of those who urge them upon our attention, how they propose to reconcile them—if they do propose to reconcile them at all—with that great gospel scheme, which rests on evidence as sure as any truth of science whatever, and on which depends all our hope of a glorious immortality. The question, be it remarked, is not one about dates and numbers, nor about the interpretation of particular words or texts, but about the great essentials of Christianity.

X. GENERAL LITERATURE.

The Huguenots, their Settlements, Churches, and Industries in England and Ireland. By SAMUEL SMILES. John Murray.

Our readers must be generally familiar with the sad story of the Huguenots, both as an integral part of European history, and as a

special subject of historical inquiry. Mr Smiles, the well-known biographer of the British Engineers, has here presented us with a valuable contribution to the literature of this deeply interesting subject. The cruel suppression of French Protestantism, leading to the exodus of nearly a million and a half of the noblest sons of France, was, as all admit, the occasion of the most beneficial results to the cause of civil and religious liberty, in those countries which afforded them an asylum, contributing also largely to their scientific and literary advancement, industrial progress, and general prosperity. In the same degree was France directly impoverished, and in a still greater degree she became consequently degenerate in each and all of those qualities wherewith her persecuted children enriched an alien soil. For France did not even retain the position she had already acquired, and, ceasing to progress, she retrograded. Other states, and particularly England, stood mainly in want of such a valuable accession, as they thus obtained, and their national life thereby received an impetus which has led to much that is great in the past, and which, in its substantial effects, is still appreciable. This proposition Mr Smiles has anew demonstrated, adding to the evidence and argument of previous writers a mass of corroborative testimony most industriously collected. He has also narrated many fresh incidents, communicated many interesting facts, and traced as far as possible the now disintegrated Huguenot strata in the conglomerate crust of modern England.

This exhaustive monograph—for so it is, although its author modestly offers it as a moiety—has for its significant prologue the invention of printing, as the mechanical agent in the increased circulation of the Holy Scriptures; and for its epilogue, the French Revolution and the Reign of Terror. Between this gentle opening chorus and the closing burst of direst discord that ever vibrated through earth, the Huguenot drama enacted itself. The early scenes gave slight presage of the terrible *denouement*; but that the successive acts led stage by stage to this inevitable issue, no unbiassed historian has ever doubted. Putting Protestantism aside, is it at all possible that a systematic repression of all the moral and intellectual vitality of a great nation, continued throughout two centuries, and accompanied by a too successful policy of extermination, could otherwise eventuate than in ruin and destruction? But we may not put Protestantism aside either in its primary character, as a religious revival, or in its secondary phase, as a political power identified with the cause of the peoples. It is now a trite saying, based upon plain and palpable data, that all those European states whose rulers perversely refused to recognise the great fact that was manifesting itself in their midst, and would not acknowledge it as the inauguration of a new era, were left behind in the grand march of humanity. And not only were they left behind, for the vigorous vitality of the new-born Protestant spirit could not be blighted or quelled save by the exercise of repressive measures equal to the occasion; and those who exercised them—persecuting remorselessly unto strange cities, and to the death—courted the national decay and overthrow which inevitably supervened. Sowing the wind, they reaped the whirlwind.

As illustrative of his epoch, which was marked by the dawn of the Reformation, the life of Bernard Palissy, the potter,—lately popularised by Mr Henry Morley,—is the text of one of the early chapters in this volume. In the intervals of his unflagging toil, the celebrated discoverer of enamel founded a reformed church at Saintes, in the south-west of France—the district of Saintonge having been previously visited by Calvin, who sowed the seeds there of the new religion. The persecution, which shortly overtook and scattered the little “godly band” at Saintes, spared Palissy for a season, as he was engaged in making encaustic tiles for the castle of the Duke of Montmorency. But even the powerful protection of the high constable of France did not long avail him there; and while under arrest for heresy at Bordeaux, whither he had been dragged, his patron had him appointed “Inventor of Rustic Figulines to the King,” thus indefinitely adjourning his trial by transference to the jurisdiction of the Grand Council of Paris. Palissy established his pottery at the Tuileries (or tile works), where he long wrought at his art; but, although employed by the bigoted Catherine de Medicis, he stoutly resisted all overtures, tempting or threatening, made with a design to his apostacy. He remained a Huguenot to the last; and at the close of his long life, he was again arrested and condemned to be burnt. The execution of the sentence was however delayed; and while the martyr-fires were blazing round Paris, he died in the Bastille. How he had outlived by eighteen years the massacre of St Bartholomew’s day, can only be accounted for by the demand in high quarters for the rare enamel work that he alone could make. The case of this royal potter is typical of the political situation in his times; it is one of many that might serve as indications of the progress of the reformed religion; for, in 1561, we find a French cardinal writing in alarm to the Pope, that “the kingdom was already half Huguenot.” And the unparalleled persecutions which preceded and followed the bloody carnival of 1572, are too widely known in all their sickening details to demand recapitulation in this place. One of the effects of this cruel and mistaken policy, however, which may be noted, was the expulsion or continuous emigration, during the best part of a century, of thousands and tens of thousands of the most virtuous, intelligent, and industrious families of France, including much of her noblest blood. Even after Henry IV. promulgated the edict of Nantes, in 1598—an edict chiefly notorious in its revocation about ninety years later—the toleration which it guaranteed was not accorded, and the persecution was, with slight intermission, unabated. It was never designed as a concession, and its revocation was only the signal for checking the alarming tide of emigration, and intensifying, if that were possible, the rigour of repression. Conformity, or “conversion,” as it was styled, was the thing aimed at; not banishment or depopulation.

Huguenot is a French term of obscure and unimportant origin, and is employed to designate the followers of Calvin and Beza. Thus Mr Smiles applies it not inappropriately to the reformed churches of the Netherlands, and furthermore accepts it as almost synonymous with Protestant Refugee; for, although Lutheranism had its martyrs,

the Protestantism of Germany did not involve the exile of its professors. It is therefore within the scope of this work to treat of the civil war in Flanders, and the suppression of the Reformation there by Philip II. of Spain, who succeeded to that wealthy and prosperous province in the middle of the sixteenth century, by the resignation of the Emperor Charles V. Within little more than ten years after this ill-omened Spanish succession, the solid magnificence of that northern centre of commerce, trade, and manufactures—awhile 'outsplendouring mediæval Venice—was, by the machinations of the Jesuits, and the arms of the Duke of Alva, laid level with the dust. Protestants, as well as wealthy Papists, who had the instinct of rats, fled the country in hundreds of thousands, and as many more fell victims to the sword and the scaffold. It was a programme of extermination fulfilled until the busy quays of Antwerp were deserted, and until Bruges and Ghent became the resort of thieves and beggars. The fugitives turned their faces towards Holland, Germany, and England, forming in the latter country some of the earliest settlements, and founding in it new branches of industry. The kings of England had, during many years, endeavoured to introduce foreign manufactures, and the tyranny of trade-unions in Bruges and Ghent, had driven many artizans to a free soil and an open market; but the great Flemish tide, which now set in for these shores, contributed immensely more to our advancement in the mechanical arts, than any special measure could ever have done.

England, it will be seen, was not slack to shew hospitality to these "gentle and profitable strangers," whether fleeing from the Medicis and Guises, or from the Dukes of Alva and Parma. They were placed by Queen Elizabeth under the protection of the Crown, and were privileged alike in the exercise of their religion and handicrafts. Such a reception as was accorded to these fugitives required, at that juncture, no ordinary courage; for it placed Elizabeth under the ban of the Pope, and exposed the nation to violence from the two then "first-rate powers" in Europe. France and Spain vainly intrigued for the dethronement of the English Queen, and Philip II. determined on summary vengeance by invasion. We all know the fate of his sacred Armada, blessed by Pope Pius V., and styled "The Invincible," in the unwitting irony of history. It may be enough here to ask, with a feeling of the same irony, whether Spain has ever been a power at all in Europe, since her religious war of extermination in Flanders, which culminated in this ill-fated expedition; and to ask in sober earnest, whether England would shortly have become what she did, but for the part which she then so nobly acted, consciously in the sight of God?

The chief Flemish settlements in England were at Sandwich, Norwich, and London, but there were many others in various parts of the country; and as a slight indication of their number, it is stated that in Norwich alone they mustered about five thousand persons, previously to the great French immigration, which followed upon St Bartholomew's day. The industries, a knowledge of which they communicated, were chiefly the manufactures of paper, fine woollen cloth, silks, damasks, beaver and felt hats, woollen stockings

linen thread, and lace; besides a knowledge of mining, iron-working, and gardening. Sheffield also learnt how to make steel, from a company of Liege artificers, who were settled there by the Earl of Shrewsbury; and at Yarmouth, the first important English fishery was established by a body of seafaring Flemings; whilst in London, the exiled merchants of Antwerp helped to burden the Thames with richer freights than the Scheldt had borne. There were vulgar jealousies, however, to contend with; and if they were not so unhappily incidental to human nature, they might, as in themselves they ought to do, raise a deeper blush to the honest English face. Can it be believed that, with a selfish and ignorant temper, the very people who had been thus instructed in the mysteries of so many unfamiliar trades, turned round upon their benefactors and demanded their expulsion from the guilds of their own fostering? Alas! it must; but it is some qualification of our shame to know, that "good Queen Bess" came to the rescue, denouncing the conspiracy that was on foot to expel the Walloon settlers, and expostulating in her primitive fashion with her lieges. The threatened trade outrage, nevertheless, drove many Flemish weavers from Norwich, some to Holland, but some also to Yorkshire, where they founded the woollen manufactures. It is worthy of remark, that, previously to this accession of industrial strength from abroad, almost all the wool grown in England was sent to be made into cloth on the continent, and thence again imported; and that our now common vegetables were, up to that time, grown in the low countries, whence they were exported hither to be sold at high prices to the nobility. Agricultural drainage was also unknown in the wide English fens and flats, until those days when we "entertained angels unawares."

This peaceful Walloon invasion partially preceded in point of time the great influx of French Huguenots, and was partially contemporary with its earlier stages. A few settlements, having accidentally acquired, continued accidentally to retain a Flemish character, just as not a few remained distinctly French; but French and Flemish accents were soon heard mingling in many of the new centres of industry. Owing to the barrier of language, however, those accents did not usually mingle in divine service, as the numbers of separate churches—Walloon and French Protestant—spread over the face of the land, sufficiently attest. The entire mass of Huguenots who fled after the great massacre in Paris, or were driven by the dragonades of the provinces, to seek an asylum in England, were distinctively Calvinist, and their freedom of worship was scrupulously allowed them, under protection of the primate of the Church, even while an Anglican conformity was being thrust upon the native people. Charles I., it is true, with help of Archbishop Laud, during a few years of bigotry, did contrive to scare away several thousands of these refugees to Holland and to Massachusetts Bay, where they merged in the little New England family; but this reactionary course was speedily checked, as those who had adopted it sharply found to their cost. We need not here enumerate the foreign Protestant churches which were planted in different parts of the country; it is enough to say that they were erected in great numbers wherever the sufferers

for conscience' sake founded their busy little colonies. Having come among us in search of that religious liberty which had been denied them in their native homes, they were not likely to remain without places of solemn assembly. The French settlements were principally at such towns and burghs as Southampton, Canterbury, Rye, Winchelsea, Colchester, Stamford, Maidstone, Thetford, and Glastonbury, in addition to those districts already part-colonised by Flemings, and there were numerous congregations formed in them all. London, of course, as being the chief settlement, contained at one time no fewer than thirty-five Huguenot churches, of which eleven were situate in Spitalfields alone, but that was after Louis XIV. had done his utmost to destroy his kingdom. As the French exiles relinquished all hope of returning to their unnatural soil, and gradually amalgamated with the English population, the attendance at the Huguenot churches naturally fell off; and it is pathetic to read the appeals of their old pastors made in reference to this defection. One of the most famous of the foreign churches was at Southampton; it was styled "God's House," and its curious records have been preserved. But the most interesting *souvenir* of those days still survives at Canterbury, where, under the roof of the cathedral, about twenty persons representing the old Huguenots, continue, at this present hour, to meet and conduct their simple service in French, within the chapel of the undercroft. At one time there were many silk and stuff weavers from Tours, and not less than a thousand looms at work in that old cathedral town.

The Huguenots, who, in the reign of Charles IX., could boast "two thousand and fifty churches, and four hundred thousand men able to bear arms,"—if Coligny's estimate be correct—ceased under Louis XIII., sixty years later, to be an armed power in France. We cannot help thinking, that if all this force had been properly organized and methodically opposed to the dominant Catholic party in the State, the Protestant cause would in all probability have triumphed; as it did in Scotland, for example, against greater odds; or as it did in England at the Revolution of 1688. The event was otherwise, however, and greater evils than war have followed in its train. Meanwhile, the then master-spirit in France, Cardinal Richelieu, having at last effectually disarmed the Huguenots, they ceased to exist as a political party; and with a wise and tolerant spirit, he prevailed upon Louis XIII. to issue, in 1629, the "Edict of Pardon," which granted liberty of worship and other privileges to the Protestants. This, in effect, was only a respite; but, while the pardon was in force, the Huguenots had an opportunity of proving themselves loyal subjects and exceptionally prosperous and honourable citizens. On the accession of Louis XIV., even the squeamish Cardinal Mazarin was constrained to speak well of the industrious heretics, and the great Colbert recognised their importance to the welfare of the State. The "*Grand Monarque*," however, was of a different mind, and having first enfeebled the nation by foolish and ambitious wars, and having worried Colbert to death by defeating all his plans for the industrial and financial improvement of the country, he performed penance for his amours by renewing the persecution of his Protestant

subjects. Mr Smiles has satisfactorily shown that all the great men who adorned France during this much extolled reign, belonged to the earlier period of comparative liberty which the Huguenots enjoyed under the protection of Colbert. But even Colbert had not been able altogether to restrain the Royal Egotist, and after his death, a work of persecution was undertaken which in its barbarous ferocity and malice was hitherto without parallel even in France. We have not space at our disposal, for a leaf out of the long catalogue of its revolting details ; nor is it necessary to do more than barely refer to the inhuman and dastardly war that was waged, throughout the length and breadth of French territory, against defenceless men, women, and children, as the occasion of that great, steady, and long continued stampede which followed. The Revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685—the crowning cruelty of those bloody orgies—was equivalent to the forcible extirpation of Protestantism in France, and we need hardly stay to demonstrate the wide and terrible significance of that fact, which was indeed accomplished. To add to the misery of the situation, the Huguenots were prohibited from flight, and the sea coast and the frontiers were well guarded. Of those caught in the act, the men were either condemned to death or the galleys for life ; while the women were either flogged, branded, and imprisoned or immured for life in convents. The alternative of flight was, of course, “conversion,” and many embraced it in despair, but the flight continued and increased in the teeth of all the obstacles and penalties imposed. The extraordinary magnitude of this emigration is computed by Sismondi at a figure not far short of a million of persons, and they were of the best in France. The Revocation gave a death-blow to several great branches of French industry, and proved almost fatal to the prosperity of Lyons, Tours, and Nantes. “More than a hundred years,” we are told, elapsed “before Lyons was restored to its former prosperity, and then it was only to suffer another equally staggering blow from the violence and outrage which accompanied the outbreak of the French Revolution.” The unhappy fugitives fled on all sides in the directions of Switzerland, Germany, Holland, and England ; and most substantial benefits did they confer in return for the hospitality they received in those countries. Of the important influence on European politics thus exercised, let us hear what Mr Smiles has to say :—“Among its other effects, the flight of the Huguenots contributed to establish religious and political freedom in Switzerland : it strengthened the foundations of liberty in the then comparatively insignificant electorate of Brandenburg, which has since become developed into the great monarchy of Prussia ; it fostered the strength and increased the political power and commercial wealth of the States of Holland ; and it materially contributed to the success of the English Revolution of 1688, and to the establishment of the British constitution on its present basis.”

We must hasten, however, to conclude our imperfect summary of this instructive work. It is calculated that about one-fourth of the Huguenot exiles sought the British shores as an *asylum Christi*, and on reaching them, through much untold trial and difficulty, many a

pious soul fell down on his knees and kissed the ground while thanking God for deliverance. But they were not all very Protestant or very devout, although the great majority were ; for many philosophers and men of science and letters had fled from an atmosphere equally stifling to free thought and independent judgment. This volume furnishes full particulars respecting the most conspicuous of this intellectual galaxy, in a long list of authors, philologists, lexicographers, jurisconsults, oriental scholars, mathematicians, mechanical philosophers, inventors and engineers, as well as many other experts who settled in England. At the same time, it is added, that "the most eminent of the refugees were unquestionably the pastors, some of whom were men highly distinguished for their piety, learning, and eloquence," and the book supplies proof of the statement. It is curious to observe that, while those of the earlier immigration remained staunch Calvinists, many of the later arrivals accepted benefices in the English Church. The industries already planted by previous settlers from Flanders and France, were also more fully developed, and other branches of manufacture were introduced, such as the fabrication of glass, cutlery, needles, combs, gloves, buttons, ribands, silk stockings, velvets, jewellery, clocks and watches, as well as calico printing, and the linen trade. This last, now almost exclusively identified with the province of Ulster, was first introduced in Ireland under the auspices of the Earl of Strafford, when chief deputy, or Lord-Lieutenant, in the reign of Charles I. Many refugees were subsequently despatched thither at the expense of the State, and the Irish Parliament offered them letters of naturalisation. French colonies were thus planted at Dublin, Waterford, Cork, Kilkenny, Lisburn, and Portarlington, where various industries were started ; but the only traces of them are in the silk tabinet or Irish poplin manufacture of Dublin, and the great linen trade of the north, of which Belfast is now the emporium. The civil commotions arising out of the event of 1688,—the memory of which still vulgarly survives in the "Orange" masquerade,—were inimical to manufacturing enterprise in Ireland, although Protestant Ulster contrived to weather the storm. Very interesting brief memoirs are given by Mr Smiles of some of those apostles of Irish industry, more especially of Louis Crommelin and Peter Goyer, who assisted in establishing the flax cultivation and linen manufacture at Lisburn,—the former having obtained a patent in that interest from William III.—and there is also a very spirited narrative of the adventures of De la Fontaine, who began the woollen manufacture at Cork. The little aristocratic circle of Portarlington is likewise very graphically described, but we may not linger amid its gentle attractions. This volume further incidentally mentions the Huguenot settlements in Scotland, the chief of which was in a district of Edinburgh, long since known as "Little Picardy," and its site is now partially occupied by Picardy Place. It was a colony of silk weavers, but the failure of their mulberry plantations—plantations which also failed in England—induced them to modify their operations, and they then started the shawl manufacture which was long carried on in that city. "Little Picardy" dates from the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes,

but there were French settlements in Edinburgh earlier than that by a century, which Mr Smiles has apparently overlooked. It is recorded, under date May 1586, that the magistrates of Edinburgh granted the use of the University Hall as a place of worship to a body of Huguenots, under the pastorate of Pierre du Moulin, a minister of Paris, whose stipend they also paid. The paper manufacture was likewise introduced into Scotland by French settlers of the later flight; but the art of printing was first acquired by the Scotch at a very early date from Holland, and up to the middle of the seventeenth century, the Bible of Andro Hart, and the Prayerbook of Robert Young, both printers in Edinburgh, had not been equalled in beauty of typography by any English press. Mr Smiles, it must here be observed, is wrong in adducing the special pleading of "Anderson's Widow," as an evidence of an assumed historical fact that, in 1683, "one printing press was sufficiently able to supply all Scotland." Watson, in the preface to his *History of Printing*, has adequately exposed the character of the dishonest attempt at monopoly, which preferred the above statement in its defence.

Before concluding, we may not leave unnoticed the many able generals and gallant soldiers whom this crisis procured to the English army. The abdication of James II. and the English Revolution, which placed William Prince of Orange on the throne, occurring only three years after the infamous Revocation, brought thousands of hard fighting Huguenots and military heroes to rally round the cause of constitutional freedom, which had now sprung from Protestantism as one of its richest fruits. Isaac Dumont de Bostaquet, a Protestant gentleman, whose inedited memoirs first appeared about three years ago in Paris, was one of the principal actors in the revolutionary war; and Mr Smiles has done well to narrate his adventures at length, as they give a truly realistic aspect to the period. We all know how William's French Huguenots met the French Catholic troops of Louis, under the Jacobite king, at the battle of the Boyne; and the distinguished names of many of those warriors are enrolled in our national history.

The only other feature in the present volume to which we regret we can now do no more than barely allude, is the interesting account given of the descendants of those intelligent refugees, many of whom now fill high offices amongst us. There is still, however, the feeble remnant of silk weavers at Spitalfields, lately brought under the notice of the charitable, by the Rev. Isaac Taylor, incumbent of St Matthias, a parish embracing the district; and we cannot better conclude our remarks than by seconding that gentleman's appeal.

LAICUS.

Memoir of William Edmonstoune Aytoun, D.C.L. By THEODORE MARTIN. W. Blackwood & Sons.

It has been said that Professor Aytoun stood in the same relation to Jacobite Literature, that some grudgeful and choleric Highland Laird, of two or three generations back, might have occupied towards the forlorn cause of the Stuarts. And there is some truth in the

remark, for the manner in which, in his *Lays of Scottish Cavaliers*, he rails at the "grim Geneva ministers," is rather suggestive of the sour spirit of a defeated faction, than of the catholic temper of the poet, or the liberality of the man of letters. He would mainly have been justified against such a construction by the purely dramatic character of his cavalier effusions,—as he himself desired to be, and as Robert Browning is, for example—were it not that the copious notes which accompanying them affirm his unqualified acceptance of the doubtful items of history, to which they owe their distinctive character. His fluent Tory journalism, shrewd as it is, with a mother-wit which is better than political sapience, bears traces throughout of its origin in the "White Cockade," for in his romantic mood, all was *interregnum* since the Revolution; to him the Whigs were still the Hanoverians of Hanbury Williams, and had he witnessed the Reform of 1867, it would have been chiefly remarkable in his eyes as "dishing the Whigs." Let us not be too severe, however, upon the genial humourist we have lost;—he was withal "such a touchy, testy, pleasing fellow"—we have said all that we think necessary in the way of detraction, to give it the worst name, but with no carping spirit, for we should have much more to say, had we the space, in recognition of his literary talents, and of the pleasure we have so often derived from many of his lively pieces.

Aytoun has elsewhere been described as struggling under the fallen mantles of Scott and Wilson, but this seems to us an unfair hit, considerably wide of the mark. Whatever of Scott's genius he had not, and he admired it fondly, he never pretended to any of it, and he possessed such a high poetical faculty and critical insight, that we might almost say of his general style, both in racy prose and manly verse, that it was Aytounian in its originality and vigour. His delicate irony and sarcasm were peculiarly his own, and his humour partook rather of "heart-easing mirth" than of the boisterous hilarity of Wilson. The subject and structure of *Bothwell*, it is true, with the unhappy difference of monologue, remind one accidentally of the Ariosto of the North, whose metrical narrative is of the same *genre*, but this is all that can be said on that score; and for our part, we fail to detect in any of Aytoun's writings a resemblance, whether of manner or matter, to the style of "Lusty Christopher." From influences of literary association, indeed, we could not look to find him exempt, but he was no more the *simulacrum* of Wilson than Wilson was of Lockhart. If we must seek for "a man of his similitude," we shall have a better chance of finding him in a certain other Christopher, who was surnamed Marlowe.

There were so scanty materials for the construction of a biography of this "straggler from the files" of a bygone Edinburgh literature, that Mr Theodore Martin is rather to be complimented than blamed for this graceful memorial of his accomplished quondam colleague. The admiring and not ungrateful readers of *I'irmilian* and the *Bon Gaultier Ballads* will generally be heedless of the uneventful and amiable life of him who catered so well for their tastes. A few lines contain all that is considered needful by way of introductory memoir to the lively cabinet pictures of last century manners, as drawn by

Smollett, and so it will be with this last, but not least, of Scottish humourists. The best of most authors' lives is in their works, and we are no more interested in the Orcadian Shrievalty of this modern Athenian wit, than in the inglorious gaugership of the Ayrshire Bard. The most graphic and interesting chapter in the volume before us is that containing Lieut.-Col. Hamley's pleasant reminiscences of the reputed editor of *Blackwood*, and the industrious Professor of Rhetoric and Belles Lettres in the University of Edinburgh. The Professor's *Lays* are unquestionably the basis of his reputation, although he is even more widely known through the *Glenmutchkin Railway*, a squib charged with Attic saltpetre, and aimed at the great mania of 1845. His best success was with short and dashing pieces written off at a heat, for he was too fastidious with larger undertakings. The rather pretentious poem of *Bothwell*, which he ultimately acknowledged as a failure, actually hurt his health by its prolonged exaction; and his novel of *Norman Sinclair*, excellent in parts, is wanting in coherence, and its materials might have yielded a plentiful crop of the shorter tales, which were his special *forte*. A critic in the *Saturday Review*, writing at the time of its appearance, took exception to the stilted and pedantic style of some of the dialogues, but those seemed very natural to us, pleasantly recalling the whimsically judicious conversation of educated Scotchmen. *Firmilian*, on the other hand, owed its charm to the dashing continuity and careless power with which it unhaltingly proceeded "to the bitter end," no less than to its literary prodigality and satirical force. It is simply the best burlesque dramatic poem in the language, although some familiarity with the ephemeral "spasmodic" poetry of the day, to which it gave the *coup de grace*, may be requisite for its full appreciation. In a letter to his biographer, he tells him it was "written *currente calamo*, for this sort of crambo comes out as fluently as prose. It is very curious," he remarks, when you sit down to write this kind of thing, to find how very closely some of the passages approximate to good poetry; and I am really of opinion that the best things in Marlowe were owing mainly to a fine rhythmical ear and a reckless energy." Of a verity, Mad Kit's *Devil* and *Dr Faustus* appear to have had a hand in its conception; but the strong spice of humour did not come thence in ordinary generation. We do not wonder that the "admirers of *Festus* and the other works at which the satire was aimed, were sorely puzzled what to make of it," for it purported to be a serious production of their school, and appeared as the work of an original writer. But when the truth was known, it "left them with an unpleasant consciousness that the satirist was quite a match for their favourite bards, even where they were strongest."

Of Professor Aytoun's translations from Goethe, executed in concert with Mr Martin, we regret that from want of cognizance we cannot speak, but in Ballad Poetry we may advisedly say he was *facile princeps*. His authentic edition of the *Scottish Ballads* is the only good collection since the "Border Minstrelsy"; and his humorous *renaissance* of these popular ditties, in his contributions to *Bon Gaultier*, will not improbably survive many of their prototypes. They are infinitely superior to any serious modern experiments in the

old style, with the exception of his own spirited *Lays*—and these, apart from other considerations, have a superiority over Macaulay's, in respect of the later spirit of chivalry, which is as essential to this class of composition, as it is foreign to the genius of "Ancient Rome." We are sensible of an anachronism in the romantic treatment of classical subjects. Be that as it may, however, we are not called to its discussion in connection with the Memoir of Aytoun, and should not have adverted to the matter had not the suggestive comparison been so generally instituted. Our business is now briefly to cite a few words from the closing paragraphs of the accomplished biographer, who, while delicately disclaiming criticism, has given us a sketch of the character of his friend, and indicated his place in literature. The citations are these :—"Deeply imbued with all that "is best in literature, his influence as a critic and teacher was always used to expose what was false to nature, mean in thought, meretricious or effeminate in style, and to call attention to what was highest and truest in tone, and purest in expression. His range of topics was wide, but all he wrote was ever on the side of virtue, and honour, and religion. His wildest sallies of humour never strayed into coarseness or irreverence, and he was intolerant of both in other men. He was singularly gentle, just, considerate and forbearing to everything but meanness, vulgarity, and conceit; and even when most provoked by these, he would, out of his large charity, find excuses for the 'weak but well-meaning creatures' in whom they had been offensively shewn. . . . His powers as a humourist were perhaps greater than as a poet. They have certainly been more widely appreciated. His immediate contemporaries owe him much, for he has contributed largely to that kindly mirth without which the strain and struggle of modern life would be intolerable. Much that is excellent in his humorous writings may very possibly cease to retain a place in literature, from the circumstance that he deals with characters and peculiarities which are in some measure local, and phases of life, and feeling, and literature, which are more or less ephemeral. But his name will be coupled with those of Wilson, Lockhart, Sidney Smith, Peacock, Jerrold, Mahoney, and Hood, as that of a man gifted with humour as genuine and original as theirs, however opinions may vary as to the order of their relative merits." Such, in effect, is the estimate of the man and of the author, formed by one who feelingly tells us that he "lived too near him, and loved him too well to be an impartial critic of his work." For ourselves, only knowing the man in the author, we can say that it seems as impartial and critical as it is appreciative and sympathetic, and only perhaps errs in the discretion of reserve. LAICUS.

Books in Series.

There are now in course of publication several very interesting and attractive series of works, some original, and some that are old friends in a new dress, to which we purpose directing the attention of such of our readers as may, at vacant hours of relaxation, take pleasure in the tasteful conceits of our modern bibliopoles. Many volumes of those serial issues have appeared during the last few years, and many more

within the last few months, and to none of them have we yet adverted in these pages. The order of publication in each series is rather occasional than periodical—the editors and publishers, let us hope, being free from those statedly recurring necessities of the literary market in our day, incidental to a high-pressure civilisation.

We cannot more worthily head our list than with those volumes which emanate from the Chiswick Press, now historically associated with the English disciple of Aldus—the late William Pickering—who, like most public benefactors, received only, we might say, a complimentary benefit to himself as the reward of his exquisite industry. The taste which he so largely contributed to form, he did not live to see so fully developed. From this now fruitful press we have then first, in point of time, the POCKET VOLUMES and the ELZEVIR SERIES of Messrs Bell and Daldy, the latter series being, for the most part a reproduction of the former, on larger paper. There is not much editing about either, except what is implied in the careful supervision of the texts; but who wants editorial comment in handy readable volumes of such authors as Shakespeare and Milton, George Herbert and Isaac Walton, Burns, Cowper, and Coleridge, Washington Irving and Longfellow? Milton is printed from the text of Mr Keightley's library edition, under that gentleman's care, and he also suggests a few textual emendations on corrupt readings of passages in Shakespeare's Plays, either elucidatory of the sense, or restorative of the dramatic metre. The edition of Burns is carefully revised from the Aldine one, and contains "some entire poems, several additional stanzas, and numerous important variations" from original MSS. of the author's collected by Mr Pickering. The other books of these elegant selections are mostly without annotation or prefatory remark, and consist of such standard works as *Lamb's Tales from Shakespeare*, *Southey's Life of Nelson*, *White's Natural History of Selborne*, *Seasons and Ballads*, chiefly Dibdin's, *The Robin Hood Ballads*, chiefly from Ritson, together with the favourite pieces of the authors already named. There are still, however, so many brilliant gems of enduring substance in our literature, we should like to see in a similar appropriate setting, that we trust the publishers may be encouraged to proceed with their meritorious work.

Two volumes of the BAYARD SERIES, issuing from the same press, and published by Messrs Sampson Low, and Company, have just reached us. The plan of this new series does not differ materially from the preceding, save in what may be inferred from the circumstance that the first instalments are translations from the French. One would have expected as much from the collective title, with the knightly legend, *sans peur et sans reproche*, which we do not see the need of translating, to the loss of its old fragrance. The life of *le bon chevalier*—Bayard himself—is, of necessity, the first of the little books before us, and the *History of St Louis* by his contemporary Joinville is most fitly, the second. The spirit of these brave chronicles is well conserved in their English garb, and they are, in truth, the finest bloom of the flower of chivalry still yielding a "liquid sweet" to us. The author of the *Broad Stone of Honour*, accused Cervantes of something of sacrilege in the creation of his gaunt

knight-errant of La Mancha, but there was then a need of satire on that head, and none could have been more discriminate and almost reluctant in its exercise, for the Spanish Don is one of the most honourable gentlemen in the compass of imaginative literature. The Chevalier Bayard, however, was neither errant nor erratic, neither was he mercenary, as knights were becoming in his day, but the last of the true knightly succession, there being no name subsequent to his that we regard as purely exemplary of knighthood. He was the latest worthy representative of his order, and we must remember that Don Quixote did not make his redoubtable appearance until nearly a century after his death. It is more difficult perhaps to realise the fact that he was a prisoner of our "bluff King Hal," at the "battle of the Spurs," so unromantic for the most part are our associations with that bulky Tudor. There is a cruder chivalry than Bayard's, and older by three hundred years, in the companion history of Louis IX. of France, with his resolute face against all Turks, Jews, and Infidels; but there is a fine moral to be learnt from it despite its intolerance, which after all belongs to the period. And, indeed, what were a true knight without the most uncompromising intolerance of whatever was evil in his eyes? The following kingly advice is not therefore to be acted on literally by our ingenuous youth who may become enamoured of this quaint and charming volume;—"Wherefore, I tell you," said the king [having just recounted the story of a cripple knight who belaboured a Jewish Rabbi with his crutch, on account of his unbelief] "therefore, I tell you, that no one, if he is not a very clever clerk, ought to dispute with them [unbelievers]; but a layman, when he hears the Christian law evil spoken of, should not defend that law save only with his sword, which he ought to run into the infidel's belly as far as it will go.'" Surely no one will commit the error of testing this utterance by any other weights and measures than those of the age and country to which it belongs. The political and social economics of our great sires—necessary preludes to later forms—are permanent links in that historical catena, to which we are adding of our handiwork, and were, we trust, relatively "true for them," as it is to be hoped our vaunted progress in such "empirical arts" may morally be for us. The modern spirit should be refined and humanised by an intelligent comparison of old and new standards of thought and conduct.

Next on our list we have the GENTLE LIFE SERIES, from the same publishers as the immediately preceding, a series which likewise takes its name from its initial volume. Mr Friswell, the author of *The Gentle Life*, is understood to be the editor of these "companionable" books; and *The Gentle Life* itself is a volume, now followed by a second, consisting of "Essays in aid of the Formation of Character." Some of these essays are somewhat tame and tedious although short, but their manner is highly refined, and their matter, if commonplace, is unimpeachably good—so good, indeed, that we fear the blame of tedium we have imputed is nighly tantamount to our own moral inculpation. The more or less common sensational life of our day, with its deteriorated public *morale*, stands much in need of such a wholesome alterative treatment as this accomplished writer adminis-

ters ; albeit the treatment might have been more bracing. A third collection of these essays is published under the title of *About in the World*. There is a slightly pedantic "old essayist" meandering style about them all, with large discursive reference to books and authors ; but these last essays have, in addition, some allusion to current events at the time of writing, which may serve to antique them to ordinary readers a few years hence. The other volumes in this series are five, to wit—*Like unto Christ*, a delicately, appreciative, and punctiliously faithful translation of the *De Imitatione Christi : Familiar Words*, a handy dictionary of popular quotations from English authors : *Essays by Montaigne*, being an edited selection of that Frenchman's delightful and edifying prattle, which seems to be in a manner the key-note of the Gentle Life : *Varia ; or, Readings from Rare Books*, another collection of Mr Friswell's literary essays, largely commending itself to us by reason of the loving manner in which the author assigns positions of honour to certain of our old and trusty councillors ; and lastly, the *Countess of Pembroke's Arcadia*, written by Sir Philip Sidney, Knight, the only volume of the series which, at the first, occasioned disquietude within us—it was only at the first, however, as we have said, for we could not, upon reflection, fail to recognise the editorial necessities implied in a popular reproduction of such a splendidly otiose but somewhat euphuistical masterpiece. This edition will send the devout literary pilgrim to one of the original folios, and he will possibly then have personal experience of the truth of the saying, that there is no man in the England of to-day who ever read the *Faerie Queene* or the *Arcadia* completely through. We hope to see Sidney's *Sonnets* and the *Defence of Poesie* in a companion volume of this series, but meanwhile a *Concordance to Milton's Poems* is advertised as a forthcoming instalment.

Come we now to the GOLDEN TREASURY SERIES of Messrs Macmillan & Co., at present numbering about sixteen well-selected and admirably edited works, most of which are already familiar to the rising generation, although they are not exclusively adapted to their meridian. Intelligent boys and girls do not like books whose titles, or ostentatiously condescending tone, brand the recipients as juveniles, while nevertheless they may have a deeper feeling of the poetry of childhood and youth than their unsympathetic patrons. Any chance of such a misunderstanding on that ground is quite impossible with the tempting *rouleaux* of the "Golden Treasury;" for, in common with the other collections we are here approving, they are nearly all equally acceptable to such as are of riper years. They are "guid geir in little buik." We should make this a page of a catalogue, if we enumerated all the contents of the series, but we may briefly indicate their general character. In poetry, we have the late Alexander Smith's loving edition of *Robert Burns*—the work of a true guild brother—and two volumes of critically selected *Songs, Lyrics, and Narrative Poems*, "from the best poets," under the capable and scrupulous editorship of Mr F. T. Palgrave and Mr Coventry Patmore ; besides a choice *Ballad Book*, edited by Mr W. Allingham, and a *Song Book* with "Words and Tunes from the best Poets and Musicians, selected and arranged by John Hullah." The name of

Mr Hullah, in connection with such a subject, is a host in itself; his book is in five parts—English, Scottish, Irish, Welsh, and American—a division which might have been advantageously indicated by a table of contents, but that is a small matter. The American division, however, should either have been much enlarged—it contains only four songs—or altogether excluded. Then, in sacred poetry, we have Sir Roundell Palmer's now widely favoured *Book of Praise*, "selected from the best English hymn writers;" and a *Sunday Book of Poetry*, edited by a lady, the best thing of the kind we have ever met with, being a compilation suitable alike for those who are and those who may profitably become as little children. The Book of Praise has already achieved its position, and stands in need of no commendation of ours. The only objection that we have ever seen urged against it is, most melancholy for the objector, that it represents, as if that were possible, too many diversities of Christian mood and character. Then in prose, we have accurate reprints, from the early editions, of *Bacon's Essays*, with "Notes and Glossarial Index," by Mr W. Aldis Wright, of Cambridge;—of *Robinson Crusoe*, under the care of Mr J. W. Clark, also of Cambridge; and of the *Pilgrim's Progress*. More captivating little copies of these diversely great works, we could not imagine. Then "the author of John Halifax" gives us "the best Popular Fairy Stories, selected and rendered anew," under the title of the *Fairy Book*—a selection and a rendering worthy of Bechstein or Andersen—the product of a discriminate collation of Perrault, the Countess d'Alnois, and the Brothers Grimm, with the indispensable addition of "the real old English fairy tales." There is a fine temper in the announcement that "all modern stories have been excluded." Then "the author of the Heir of Redclyffe" gathers and narrates "the *Golden Deeds* of all times and of all lands," with that moral intention of purpose and religious penetration which characterise her practical style. The nature of her present task is fortunately such as to prevent her indulgence in those valetudinarian casuistries which occasionally mar her otherwise excellent writings. And now, at the end of our list, although not in order of publication, here is a *Jest Book* compiled by no less a personage than "the editor of *Punch*," Mr Mark Lemon. The Chancellors of this Golden Exchequer are, it will be acknowledged, among the most competent for the office of any of our *literati*; and it only remains to add that each coin of this "fairy gold" bears a royal stamp in the shape of a vignette or gem, designed by such masters as Millais, Woolner, and Noel Paton, and engraved by Jeens. We had almost omitted to mention that this series farther contains a third edition of Davies' and Vaughan's translation of *Plato's Republic*; and we observe a volume of *French Lyrics* is also announced.

MOXON'S MINIATURE POETS is, *par excellence*, the Parnassian course in this banquet of dainties, at which we presume to act the Ganymede or more modestly perhaps, to which we are as a wayside mercury or finger-post. It is withal a frugal banquet, and a wholesome,—*Mundaque Parvo sub lare Pauperum cœna, sine aulæis et ostro*—within the reach of any guest who spares his *denarii* from the too common dyspeptic diet of our evil days. The contents of this

"Miniature" series may be disposed in two classes, one comprising *Selections* from living poets authorised by themselves; and the other consisting of *Selections* from those, "all the daughters of whose music have been brought low." The latter are critically prefaced by the editors, who wreath their *immortelles* in garlands of their own outliving poesy. In one instance, indeed, we have an all too Olympian panegyric: it is upon Byron; but his encomiast is the classical Swinburne, and the necessary allowance will be made in respect of the sham-paganism of which he is the stripling priest. In order to place the image of Byron in its niche, an iconoclastic work has to be performed upon those of Wordsworth, Keats, Coleridge, and Southey; and, after all, Byron's niche is vacant. Byron, we are told, "fed upon nature with a holy hunger, following her with a divine lust, as of gods chasing the daughters of men;" whereas "Coleridge and Keats," it is said, "used nature mainly as a stimulant or sedative; Wordsworth as a vegetable fit to shred into his pot, and pare down like the outer leaves of a lettuce for didactic and culinary purposes." These mephitic vapours of Mr Swinburne's will be offensive to all who have breathed the pure mountain air either with Scott or Wordsworth, to such as may have

" — felt the sentiment of Being spread,
O'er all that moves and all that seemeth still;—
The presences of Nature in the sky
And on the earth; the visions of the hills,
And souls of lonely places."

—lonely places which they will not quit to look upon a lascivious fiddler within the excavated *cloacæ* of Rome. Mr Carlyle has strongly spoken against eloquence which is not also truth, against, in short, the gilding of a lie; but with Mr Swinburne, the triumphal car with its brilliant train is the absorbing theme, let the hero and the occasion be alike unworthy. So he says of Southey:—"A poet by profession, he had assaulted with feeble fury another poet [Byron], not on the fair and open charge of bad verses, but under the impertinent and irrelevant plea that his work was an affliction or an offence to religion and morality." Certainly, if verse is everything and morality is naught, the critic is right; but we should then take leave to add that "naught is everything."* On the whole, we think the publishers might suffer this musical rodomontade to give place, in the next edition, to one of Francis Jeffrey's later essays on Byron from the *Edinburgh Review*; and in the interests of literature, we believe that Messrs Longman would not withhold permission. It is refreshing to turn from this to the genial preface written by Mr Mortimer Collins to the *Selections from the Works of Sir Walter Scott*. "His verse," he writes, "is cheery and strong, like the hunter's horn upon the mountain side. He has no false sentiment, no discontent with things as they are; no pitiful quarrel with Omnipotence—no desire to 'shatter himself against the huge black, cloud-topped, interminable præcipice of British Philistinism.' The healthier and manlier spirits

* *Vide Rejected Addresses: "Cui bono? By Lord B."*

"Thinking is but an idle waste of thought,
And naught is everything, and everything is naught."

will be found commonly on Sir Walter's side. Those who deem the macrocosm all wrong are generally tormented with microcosmic disease. All 'the hourly varied anodynes' of the modern poet, would have aroused the wonder of Sir Walter Scott. He needed them no more than did Homer and Chaucer—healthy men who were poets because they enjoyed life, not because it perplexed and wearied them. Poetry such as theirs will assuredly live longest, for it is founded on the health which is common to all generations of men." Mr F. T. Palgrave, who edits the *Selection from the Works of William Wordsworth*, is not less happy in his characterisation of the "high priest of nature." While making the proviso, that "Wordsworth, like his fellows in immortal verse, may not be compressed within the bounds of a definition," he indicates the specialties of his poetry with a critical perception and a reverent hand. The difference between Scott and Wordsworth in their love of nature seems to be that the one loved her chiefly in an objective mood, and the other more subjectively. The one looked with a fascinated gaze at the grand perspective he had englamoured with romantic associations; the other was rivetted by the peaceful murmur of a brook. Nature suggested her deep secrets to Wordsworth in intimate communion; he "seemed to fall from out himself and grow incorporate into" her. This, in justice to Mr Palgrave, however, we must say is our own generalisation, not his, which is too symmetrically whole for quotation. But we must proceed with our summary. We have adverted to three volumes of this series, of which the next edited *Selection* is from the *Works of Winthrop Mackworth Praed*. To younger readers of the present generation, this name was almost unknown, until the Rev. Derwent Coleridge collected his poems and prefixed to them a memoir. Sir George Young's preface to the present selection is biographical, and from it the reader will learn that the lately debated question of "the representation of minorities," was first mooted by Praed in 1831, who was then in Parliament. His proposal was to give two votes only to each elector in those counties where three members were to be returned. The present volume, however, is not concerned with politics. In poetry, Praed was a proficient and tasteful writer rather than a master; he was a poet of the "Annuals" and "Keepsakes," but few have written so well in those now forgotten pages, if we except Scott's occasional contributions, and Thomas Hood's exuberant verse. "He was the poet," says his editor, "of a townlife and cultivated society; but in him were united with high-breeding and culture, a warm affection and a simplicity of feeling which come through the vagaries of the wildest burlesque to affect us continually with the most genuine pathos." It should be stated that Praed himself did not consider his verse worthy of collection, because he had resolved to achieve something better in the future; but this expectation was frustrated by his premature death. As his work is comparatively so little known, we shall here transcribe, as an example of his purest style, the lines he addressed to his wife during his last illness:—

"Dearest, I did not dream, four years ago,
When through your veil I saw your bright tear shine,
Caught your clear whisper exquisitely low,
And felt your soft hand tremble into mine,

That in so brief, so very brief a space,
 He, who in love both clouds and cheers our life
 Would lay on you, so full of light, joy, grace,
 The darker, sadder duties of the wife,—
 Doubts, fears, and frequent toil, and constant care
 For this poor frame, by sickness sore bested;
 The daily tendance on the fractious chair,
 The nightly vigil by the feverish bed.
 Yet not unwelcomed doth this morn arise,
 Though with more gladsome beams it might have shone;
 Strength of these weak hands, light of these dim eyes,
 In sickness, as in health,—bless you, my own!"

It is highly merited praise to bestow upon these lines, that they approximate, in point of pathetic beauty, the matchless "Exequy" of him who was Bishop of Chichester in the troubled reign of Charles I. This volume sums up the edited *Selections* of this series, so far as published. The other "Miniature Poets," as already premised, consist of gleanings from rich harvest fields that are still under cultivation,—*Selections from the works of Tennyson, Browning, Locker, Lord Houghton, and Tupper*, which we have not left ourselves space to do more than name. This is, perhaps, just as well; for, when we came to speak of Mr Tupper, we should have been in a dilemma, seeing that we neither endorse the extravagant popular admiration his poems have attracted, nor do we approve of the fashion in which they have been made the hackneyed butt of a cruel and vulgar ridicule. We shall always be thankful to him for his scholarly translation of the Anglo-Saxon *Metres of Boethius*. Each volume of this handsome series is embellished with a portrait of the author, examples of whose works are given; and Mr Frederick Locker's charming lyrics and *vers de Société* are further illustrated by the graceful pencil of Richard Doyle.

The other serial issues of books we had contemplate noticing are, A COLLECTION OF GERMAN AUTHORS, in English, published at Leipzig, by the celebrated Tauchnitz; and Mr Strahan's Liliput series of CHILDREN'S LITERATURE. We may now briefly say that the former contains translations from such popular writers as Auerbach, Fritz Reuter, Goethe, Fouque, and Paul Heyse, in thin pocket volumes, clearly printed, elegantly covered in cloth, and at a moderate price. Better travellers' reading than these volumes supply it would be difficult to imagine, and we would specially commend them, as a change of diet, to the perusal of students who may have been losing themselves in the profundities of German philosophy and criticism. Fouque's water spirit, *Undine*, has long been familiarised in England, as also has the immortal *Faust* of Goethe, who here appears in the costume given him by Dr Anster—the first English garb he wore. The primitive sketches of German character, in the court and in the village, drawn by Berthold Auerbach, are exquisite in their natural simplicity; and Fritz Reuter's cabinet pictures of low life in Mecklenburg, in the declining days of the little Corsican's imperial rapacity in 1818, are worthy of Teniers or Ostade. This English edition of German authors is only just commenced; but if continued with the spirit and good taste which Baron Tauchnitz has identified with his press, it will afford a powerful corrective to much vile trash now

abroad in the dishonoured name of literature. Mr Strahan's children's books, which we have ventured to name from one of the series that has most commended itself to our little staff of critics in the nursery—*Liliput Levee*—are such as could hardly be got either for love or money in certain young days we wot of. The Series now musters eight little volumes, and we do not pretend to say that we have read them all. Those we have looked into seem a fair sample of the others; and we can safely affirm, that George Macdonald's *Dealings with the Fairies*, Hans Andersen's *Will o' the Wisps*, Miss Ingelow's *Stories Told to a Child*, and *Liliput Levee*, are among the most innocently seductive in interest, and unconsciously *eductive* of mental play, to be found in books of the class. We have only one objection, which we regret the necessity of making, to the *Liliput* rhymes: we object to the use of silly apocryphal legends in reference to the history of our Saviour, such as the "Parable of Peter and the Cherries," for children will certainly form a truer conception of His character, and obtain a more intimate sense of their nearness to Him, from the simple narratives of the evangelists; and in their young minds there should be no frivolous associations with such a transcendent life. This is the only flaw, however, in an otherwise excellent book; but it is serious enough in our eyes; and we are sorry to have to say as much of the delightful author of "Polly" and "Prince Philibert." The series also contains a small breviary of *Daily Devotions for Children*, the unexceptionable character of which will remedy the misteaching we have just noted.

Here, at the end of our short and rapid survey of some three score and ten pleasant volumes, we may state as a matter of practical detail, that their price averages about four shillings a-piece, and that each of them, in all series, may be separately obtained. LAICUS.

The Talmud.

No small interest has been excited by an article on the Talmud which is contained in the last number of the *Quarterly Review*. This is partly owing to the popular style in which the article is written, and partly to the important conclusions to which it seems to point. It has been read by many beyond the ordinary theological circle, and has been largely commented on by the periodical press. According to the last account we have seen, the number of the *Quarterly* in which it appears has reached a sixth edition; and this increase of circulation is undoubtedly due to the article in question, no less than to Lord Carnarvon's article on the *Conservative Surrender*. We are also told (though as yet on no very high authority) of the attention it has attracted on the Continent, and of authorised translations of it which are being made into foreign languages.

Nor will our readers marvel at all this excitement, if the Talmud really turns out what it is now represented. For, building on the article referred to, writers, of many different shades of opinion, have recently spoken of it as a solvent for all our theological difficulties. That pretentious Church organ, *The Guardian*, accustomed to speak in such grandiose language, has stated, in its largest type, that if this article had only appeared three years ago, we should have been spared most of our Biblical perplexities, and has recommended the contributors to

the forthcoming "Speaker's Commentary" to shut themselves up with the Talmud for the next seven years! The *Saturday Review*, again, so severe on sciolists of all kinds, has apparently got only its first glimpse of the Talmud through the *Quarterly's* article, and in its issue of November 2d 1867, furnishes us with the following extraordinary piece of information :—"As for the old idea that the Talmud was *not written before the Christian dispensation*, and therefore contains plagiarisms of the New Testament, that has by this time been given up along with the notion that all languages are derived from Hebrew, or that the cuneiform inscriptions are the work of worms."

It would not be fair to make the writer in the *Quarterly* responsible for the conclusions which others have drawn from his essay. We heartily admire the vigour with which his article is written, as well as the ripe and rare erudition by which it is distinguished. And he has probably enjoyed a quiet laugh at such statements as those to which we have referred above. But it cannot be denied that he has written in a manner fitted to mislead ignorant and unwary readers. While careful to avoid any such allegation as that the Talmud was "written before the Christian dispensation," he has nevertheless indulged in vague hints as to its date, which are almost certain to produce a false impression with respect to that important point. Many accordingly have concluded that he means to maintain, that such terms as "Redemption," "Regeneration," "Son of God," "Kingdom of Heaven," &c., were borrowed by our Lord from Talmudical Judaism, and embodied ideas with which the Jews of His day were already perfectly familiar. And this is the grand discovery which, by a faith as marvellous as that which removes mountains, is to put an end to our doubts and difficulties! We believe that our Lord *did*, to a considerable extent, adopt a phraseology with which the people of His day were acquainted. But whether our leading Christian terms and thoughts were derived from the Talmud will perhaps be sufficiently plain from the fact, that the Mischna—the most ancient collection of the Rabbinical traditions—was not written before the middle of the second century after Christ—while the Jerusalem Talmud was not composed before A.D. 300, and the Babylonian Talmud, which is generally known as *the* Talmud, did not come into being before the early part of the sixth century!

It is a striking indication of the present unsettled state of some men's minds in regard to the divine authority of the New Testament, that they are found grasping at any straw on which to rest their faith amid the seething ocean of infidelity. But misplaced confidence speedily gives rise to a reaction in the opposite direction. And so must it be in the case of those who are now so eagerly clinging to the Talmud. We shall watch any farther statements which may be made upon the subject. Meanwhile, it is enough to remark that, while the Mischna—that insignificant portion of the vast congeries of Jewish traditions and commentaries spoken of under the general title of the Talmud—may in its *substance* reflect some of the opinions of Palestine in our Lord's day, by far the larger portion of the work did not come into existence until centuries after Christianity had become a ruling power upon the earth.

THE LATE DR JAMES HAMILTON.

WE cannot allow the present number of our *Review* to go forth without a passing tribute to the memory of this distinguished and lamented minister of Christ, who, among the various spheres which he occupied and adorned, was one of our most valued contributors. Fain would we give expression to the feelings of poignant regret, with which, in common with lovers of the truth, in all quarters and in all parties, we mourn over the loss of a friend, a pastor, and an author, so well beloved and so fondly prized. This, however, we cannot now attempt; and, amidst the numerous testimonials with which pulpit and press are teeming, we feel it would be little better than a work of supererogation to add ours to the number. We prefer selecting, from the *Edinburgh Daily Review*, the following reflections, which appeared at the time of his death, and which, in point of literary composition, as well as heartfelt appreciation of the genius and worth of the departed, deserve a place in our columns:—

“With the fall of the yellow leaf, and at the close of a harvest-home, a good man has fallen like the leaf, to which even a Pagan poet could compare the fleeting generations of men, and has been gathered into the great garner, like the sheaf that is fully ripe. The Free Presbyterian Church in England possessed no loftier spirit than Dr Hamilton; the Church universal possesses him now, and men of every way of thinking will weep at the grave of James Hamilton, for he reminded them all, by the catholicity of his sympathies, that there is a church wider than the denominational, and that there are works in which every Christian, whatever his earthly name, may and ought to take part. His death, then, does not so much take him from us, it rather gives him to us for ever. He is now a *ktema eis aiei*, a possession that passeth not away. All his influence for good will remain among his flock by a thousand imperishable recollections, and in the world by things so written, that even the world will not willingly let them die. Without affecting to ignore, without even ceasing to lament, the differences and distractions and heartburnings which sometimes render it so difficult for those who are all,—though each in a way and with a will of his own,—pursuing the same end, he taught others to forget the difference, and turned envy into emulation. And the close of his gentle life was in keeping with its kindly tenor. He went quietly down into the clear deep waters, knowing whither he was going and in whom he had placed his trust. No paroxysm of pain appears to have distracted his mind. He received the privilege which Johnson prayed for with such an agony of earnestness,—the privilege of dying with an unclouded mind, of looking into and through the darkness, and falling asleep with open eye. In all this, amidst the grief of the mourners, there is room and reason for an equal thankfulness. The stone that marks a good man's grave is always an Ebenezer; and it is set up to mark a victory which assuredly is not the grave's. James Hamilton will be laid in the “narrow house” with the consciousness and conviction of all, that it is the only thing narrow that will ever be coupled with his name.

“Such a man was a great help, and now that he rests from his labours we cannot but recall how manifold and excellent the works are which, as the promise says, do follow him. We do not speak of the pulpit services, of which there must still, among his manuscripts, be many valuable memorials, but of those to which all the world can bear witness. In addition to his numerous original writings, it was

no slight task to undertake, and it was no small service to project, the editorship of such a serial as "Excelsior," in which he has been the means of lifting many an ingenuous youth up to take higher views, both of his pleasure and of his duty. We are not sure that we can enumerate the works he was ever sending through the press, all—and almost alike—distinguished by the same clearness of statement, the same felicity of illustration, the same sweetness of tone, and breathing the same genial piety. He gave us his "Lessons from the Great Biography," and he gave us, in a series of most beautiful biographies, examples of the kind of life produced by taking those lessons. His 'Life in Earnest' has alone, we believe, gone through from ninety to a hundred editions. With him life was very earnest, though at the same time very gentle,—never breaking a bruised reed or quenching a feeble spark. We must also number by the hundred thousand those who have clomb with him the 'Mount of Olives,' to commune with their hearts and with heaven. The 'Royal Preacher' he preached over again, and brought out divine light from both 'the Lamp and the Lantern.' The 'Happy Home' has made many homes happy, by helping to make them virtuous and wise, and his 'Emblems of Eden' glow with an

'Elysian beauty, melancholy grace,
Brought from a pensive but a happy place.'

His biographies are peculiarly genial. In addition to the numerous sketches of life and character dispersed through the four volumes of extracts from 'Our Christian Classics,' dedicated to the Bishop of London, he wrote the memoirs of Lady Colquhoun of Luss, the life and adventures of Richard Williams, who went out as surgeon to the Patagonian mission, and the memoirs of a man singularly like himself, our distinguished townsman, James Wilson of Woodville, the brother of Christopher North. They had the same love of natural science, and saw in the meanest thing that crawls a creature of the living God. They had the same genial pleasantry, the same stingless wit, the same love of quiet fun. When, during the illness that has just terminated, and after he knew that he was dying, Dr Hamilton was presented with a water-bed, stretching his limbs out on it comfortably he remarked, 'Ah, there is nothing I see after all like *unlimited lie-ability*!' His were not only among the most numerous, but the most popular writings of the day. So seldom was his bow unbent; so seldom did the sword of the Spirit in his hand come back from the spoils empty. His life was one long, healthful, cheerful, manly piece of exertion. He found the fields white for the harvest, and the Lord of the harvest's work was never wrought more honestly. No living man did better service to the Presbyterian cause, by exhibiting in his life and writings the groundlessness of the prejudices against it. It is for this service that he will chiefly be missed in England. There are many able Scotsmen in London, but none with so much of the national character, combined with so few individual angularities, as good Dr James Hamilton. Elsewhere will be found some personal details. Here it only remains for us now to pronounce over his grave the pathetic lines from Rogers, with which he himself inscribed that of his friend James Wilson:—

'When by a good man's grave I muse alone,
Methinks an angel sits upon the stone:
Like those of old on that thrice hallow'd night,
Who sat and watch'd in raiment heav'nly bright,
And, with a voice inspiring joy, not fear,
Says, pointing upward, 'Know he is not here!'

XI.—FOREIGN LITERATURE.

Theologische Studien und Kritiken. Jahrgang 1868. *Erstes Heft.*
Gotha.

This is one of the oldest, and in many respects the best, of the German theological quarterlies. With the number before us it enters on its forty-first year. It was originally founded, and for a long time edited by, Drs Ullmann and Umbreit. It is now edited by Drs Hundeshagen and Riehm, assisted by Drs Nitzsch, Müller, and Beyschlag. Under such an editorship we are justified in expecting a periodical of the highest order of merit. Since this journal began its useful career, there have sprung up around it from time to time other journals, devoting themselves specially to one or other of the many fields of theological investigation. Among these we may mention the *Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie*, edited by a brilliant staff, consisting of Dr Liebner of Dresden, Dr Dorner of Berlin, Drs Ehrenfeuchter and Wagenmann of Göttingen, Drs Landerer, Palmer, and Weizsäcker of Tübingen; the *Zeitschrift für Protestantismus und Kirche*, edited by Drs Von Hofmann and Schmid; the *Zeitschrift für Wissenschaftliche Theologie*, edited by Dr Hilgenfeld; the *Zeitschrift für die Historische Theologie*, edited by Dr Joh. Chr. Wilh. Niedner of Berlin, and Dr Kohn of Leipzig, in association with the historico-theological society of Leipzig, founded by E. F. Illgen; the *Zeitschrift für die Gesamte Lutherische Theologie und Kirche*, conducted by Drs Delitzsch and Guericke. But among all these its rivals, the *Studien und Kritiken*, with a sort of aristocratic dignity, holds on its honoured course.

As a general rule, the articles to be met with in this quarterly are distinguished by such a masterly thoroughness in their production, that, whether we can agree with the writers or not, we cannot but admire the skill and learning which they display.

The first article in the present number is entitled, "Calvin's *Institutio nach Form und Inhalt, in ihrer geschichtlichen entwicklung*," (The Form and Contents of Calvin's "Institution of the Christian Religion," in their historical development). It is from the pen of Dr J. Koestlin. The following sentences will sufficiently exhibit its design:—"Almost without number," says Calvin's most recent biographer, E. Staehelin, "is the circle of scholars, of all ranks and nations, that increasingly gather around Calvin's book, the '*Institutio*;' altogether immense the labour to which, in the course of years, it has given rise; the number of editions of it which have been published is quite beyond all reckoning; and one may, without exaggeration, affirm, that no work of such a scientific character, and of such extent, has ever had so wide a circulation." That it is worth while to examine anew a book having such an historical importance, Koestlin says no one will doubt. He then enters into a most elaborate and deeply interesting investigation of the relation of the different editions of the "*Institutio*" to one another. In doing so he takes advantage of the

splendid volumes of the *Corpus Reformatorum*,* published under the editorial care of the Strasburg Professors. In Vols. xxix. and xxx. of the "Corpus," the different editions of the "Institutio" are brought together, and printed side by side. The changes the book underwent, and the additions made to it at different periods, from the first edition of 1536, till it received its final revision at the hands of Calvin in the year 1559, are compared together, and much valuable information is thence obtained regarding the progressive development of Calvin's own views in their relation to the different controversies in which he took a part.

To this subject we hope to have the opportunity of again returning more fully when the remainder of Dr Koestlin's dissertation is published.

Vorlesungen ueber die Christliche Dogmengeschichte. Von Dr F. C. BAUR, nach dessen Tode herausgegeben, Von F. F. BAUR. Leipzig. (Lectures on the History of Christian Doctrines).

The first part of this comprehensive work appeared in 1865, and the second in 1866, bringing down the history to the end of the sixth century. The volumes are edited by the author's son. In 1858 the author published his Handbook of the History of Christian Dogmas, in which he gave scope, as far as the subject admitted, to his rationalism. The volumes before us enter more into detail, but the Hegelian philosophy vitiates the views which are developed. It is gratifying to find that the Tübingen school of theologians are distinctly losing ground in Germany. It is not likely that Baur's book will attract much attention.

Die Lehre vom freien Willen und Seinem Verhältnitz Zur Gnade in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung dargestellt. Von C. E. LUTHARDT. Leipzig. 1863.

For some considerable time this valuable work has been lying on our table for review. The author has recently been brought into notice in this country by the publication by Messrs Clark, Edinburgh, of a translation of his "Apologetische Vorträge ueber d. Grundwarheiten d. Christenthum," which is a work of great merit, and worthy of being widely studied in these times. A fifth edition of the original was published at Leipzig last year. In the department of the history of Christian Dogmas, we know no work so thorough and so satisfactory as the one mentioned above, "The Doctrine of the Free Will and its relation to the Doctrine of Grace, presented in their historical development."

Our space will not permit us at present to do justice to this work. It deserves a separate and full consideration. The ever varying and never ended controversy, as to the precise relation between the doctrine of the freedom of the will and the doctrine of divine grace, is traced

* *Corpus Reformatorum.* "Joannis Calvini opera quae supersunt, omnia ediderunt Gulielmus Baum, Eduardus Cunitz, Eduardus Reuss, theologi Argentoratenses."

with great ability by Luthardt. from the earliest down to the present times. Sometimes the one side is seen in the ascendancy, and sometimes the other. But the strife is not fruitless. The truth is, by reason of this very controversy, the more distinctly brought to light.

Zeitschrift für die gesammte lutherische Theologie und Kirche 1868. Pp. 216. *Erstes Quartalheft.* Leipzig.

This quarterly, now entering on its twenty-ninth year, is the recognised organ of the old Lutheran theology. It is under the direction of the distinguished theologians Drs Delitzsch and H. E. F. Guericke. It is very ably conducted, having among its contributors the most energetic and learned divines in Germany of this tendency of thought. It is well known that from the time of the Reformation the German Church consisted of two parties—the Lutheran and the Calvinists, or Reformed. In 1817, King Fredrick William III. published a declaration of his wish to unite the two branches of the church. In many places the king's idea of a union was enthusiastically received. There were many, however, who were violently opposed to it, particularly on the side of the Lutherans. In 1821, the king re-issued his declaration, making it more explicit and imperative. He *commanded* the union to take place. The Lutherans were not permitted to form themselves into a separate ecclesiastical body. Fines and imprisonments, and other forms of cruelty, were inflicted on those who would not fall in with the royal plan of union. In 1840, the late king issued an edict permitting the "old Lutheran" party to form themselves into a separate community. These anti-unionists have gradually increased, both in numbers and in the bitterness of their tone of hostility against the union, and against Calvinists and Calvinism. Hengstenberg is one of the chief of this "old Lutheran" party; and he does all in his power, by means of the *Evangelische Kirchenzeitung*, of which he is editor, as well as by other means, to promote its interests. The journal now before us is on the same side, and has done much to stir up animosity between the adherents of the Evangelical and of the Lutheran Confessions in Germany. The articles in the present number, which has just come to hand, are:—(1) On the import of Faith in the Old Testament; by Kübel, of Tübingen. (2) The design of the Epistle to the Romans, with a review of Mangold's "The Epistle to the Romans, and the origin of the Church at Rome," Marburg, 1866; by Dr C. J. Riggensbach of Basel. (3) On the Law of Development in the sphere of the life of Faith; a study by E. Paret of Würtemberg. Part first. (4) On the construction of the words of the Third Article of the Creed, "I believe in the Christian Church, in the forgiveness of sins, in the resurrection of the body," &c.; by H. N. Hansen. (5) On the Phædo of Plato; by F. Mezger. (6) The third of a series of articles on the question "What have been the results of the Union in Prussia;" by Uhden of Kotelow. (7) The second article on "The Lutheran Church in Prussia"; by G. L. Plitt of Erlangen. Then follows a letter from the Evangelical

Lutheran Synod of Iowa, U.S., to Dr Guericke of Halle, one of the editors of the journal, making enquiry regarding the doctrine of the Church on the office of the ministry, and on the "last things," viz., Antichrist, the conversion of Israel, and the Millenium. Dr Guericke's reply is, that in the Lutheran Church these are open questions.

This number of the journal contains the usual proportion—about 78 pages—of well written critical notices of recent theological works, contributed by different writers.

Zeitschrift für die historische Theologie. 1868. *Erstes Heft.* Gotha. Pp. 162.

This journal is conducted by Dr Kahnis, in connection with the historico-theological society of Leipzig. It has, for now many years, rendered very important service by publishing historical documents, and bringing to light valuable information which would otherwise have remained unknown. The present number contains two articles. The first conveys many interesting details regarding the distinguished mathematician, John Kepler, during the period 1596–1619. It is from the pen of Dr Paul Stark of Stuttgart. The second is a contribution to the History of Athanasius, by the late Dr Sievers of Hamburg. Both of these writers enter into their subjects with a thoroughness and minuteness of detail which we are accustomed to look for only from German theologians.

During the year 1866, there were published in Germany no fewer than at least 692 separate works, all within the department of theology. Besides these there are the following German periodicals, more or less directly of a theological or ecclesiastical character, regularly published, viz: (1.) devoted to strictly scientific discussions of theological questions, 13 different journals; (2.) to practical theology, 7; (3.) to church news in general, 18; (4.) to foreign missions, 28; (5.) to Jewish missions, 8; (6.) to home missions, 6; (7.) missions in general, 6; (8.) the operations of the Gustavus Adolphus union, which has for its object the strengthening of the church in different parts of the Fatherland, 2; (9.) church intelligence for congregations and the people, 60. Our readers will gather from the above statistics an idea of the prodigious activity of the theological mind among our Teutonic neighbours. Those who wish to see a very good "table of contents" of all these publications, may consult Hauck's "Theologischer Jahresbericht." We take this opportunity of commending that Quarterly to all who would keep themselves fully acquainted with the course of German theological literature.

XII.—AMERICAN LITERATURE.

The Princeton Review for July 1867.

This number of our old friend the *Princeton*, is mainly occupied with a long article, evidently from the pen of the worthy editor, on the projected union between the Old and New School Presbyterians of America. It is, we regret to say, decidedly opposed to that union. And our regret arises not merely from regard to the interests of Christian union, but from the evidence which this article affords, that union in their case would seem to be either undesirable or impracticable. With the sentiments of Dr Hodge, and those of the Old School whom he represents, we need hardly say, that as Calvinists and Presbyterians, we cordially sympathise ; and as to the extent of the differences which may still prevail between the two parties, we perhaps stand at too great a distance from the field to form a correct judgment. But with the profoundest respect for the talents, learning, and soundness of Dr Hodge and his friends, we cannot help thinking that they have formed their opinions regarding their brethren of the new school, rather from the contentions of the past than from the actual creed of the present generation. There are some men whose minds, once heated in the furnace of controversy, seem to retain ever afterwards, when cooled down, the impressions of men and things which they received in the hour of conflict. *Tempora mutantur* ; times, circumstances, persons, prejudices, tendencies, all have changed ; but, in regard to them, it cannot be said, *et nos mutamur in illis*, they remain unchanged ; and are apt to transfer to the existing state of things, the fears, the dislikes, and the anxieties which distracted a bygone generation. They forget that Providence is a training-school, in which men's minds are gradually emancipated from prejudice and extricated from fallacy ; that the forms of expression which in one age proved watch-words of strife, frequently lose in course of time the meaning they formerly conveyed, and that mutual misunderstandings which kept the friends of truth asunder, having yielded under the friction of mutual progress in the common cause of Christian life and labour, they find themselves prepared, unexpectedly, when they meet together in brotherly converse, to "see eye to eye, and to sing together with the voice."

We have just seen in the newspapers a report of the proceedings of a conference held at Philadelphia, of the representatives of the two schools, at which it was agreed that the two bodies should be reunited on the basis of the Westminster standards, as understood in their "historical and Calvinistic sense." For our own part we cannot understand this as indicating anything less than in their anti-arminian sense. And if the New School Presbyterians have been led, in the providence of God, to the adoption of the standards in this sense, we cannot see what should hinder any of the Old School divines from welcoming them as brethren. Christian charity is a noble

grace ; it elevates its possessors far above the conventionalities of the worldly code of honour ; and if they would not sink far below this, they will not fail to recognise their brethren in Christ, when persuaded that they substantially hold the doctrines of the gospel as truly as themselves, without demanding, as a term of reunion, that they shall penitentially confess their former faults, and formally retract their old heresies.

Since writing the above, we have received the *Princeton Review* for October, and regret to say that it holds out still less hope than we have ventured to express, of an agreement between the Old and New School Presbyterians. In reviewing an article which appeared in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, so far back as 1868, the editor places the doctrinal views of the New School, as there stated by Dr Duffield, in sharp contrast with those of the Old. He gives an account of the terms of union somewhat different from that contained in the report to which we have above referred. He says, "The plan of union proposed by the joint-committee requires that the Confession of Faith be adopted in '*its fair historical sense, as it is accepted by the two bodies.*' We know what its *fair historical sense* is, both in its self, and as it is accepted by the Old School body. But its *historical sense*, as it is accepted by the New School body, is equally, to be legalised ; and clearly to this extent, that no minister or office-bearer who holds it, in that sense, can be molested in, or refused admission to, the united body, without breach of covenant. It is therefore a chief test in regard to the merits of this proposed plan of union, if we can ascertain what the fair historical sense of these standards as accepted by the New School body, has been, and is." Taking Dr Duffield as a fair sample of New School views, the editor of this article proceeds to point out their divergence from Calvinists on the doctrines of original sin, regeneration, the atonement, and justification ; and concludes by asking, " Shall we give the foregoing theology sketched by Dr Duffield equal liberty, privilege, and authority in our church, with that of our catechisms and confessions ? Shall we fill our pulpits and church courts with its proclaimers and defenders ? Shall we subject our theological seminaries to their control, and admit them to our vacant theological chairs ? Shall we submit the books of our Publication Board to such an *Index Expurgatorius* as this theology would require ? Shall we bring back the intolerable strifes which preceded and caused the disruption ? Shall we, in short, surrender unconditionally ? For ourselves we say, No ; and in this we believe we speak the deliberate mind of our church." After language so decided as this, it would be vain, we fear, to expect any union between the parties ; and if Dr Duffield is to be held a fair exponent of the doctrinal teaching of his brethren, such a union could only be deprecated. At the same time, after carefully examining the statements on both sides, we cannot help coming to the conclusion, that much of the difference between them arises from mutual misunderstanding and misrepresentation. Certain it is, that Dr Hodge does not accept of Dr Duffield's definitions as fairly stating the views of the Old School ; and we cannot suppose that the great body of the New School divines would avow

themselves disciples of Pelagius and Arminius, whose sentiments Dr Hodge honestly believes that they have imbibed. To our view, there seems to have been on both sides a straining of their dogmatic views beyond the simplicity of Scripture and of the Reformation. May God in his mercy vouchsafe unto all of us, the guidance of the Spirit of truth and of love, so that while the purity of the gospel is preserved intact, the mournful breaches of Zion may be healed. The only other article in this number claiming our particular notice, is that on "The British Churches under Cromwell." The writer of this paper does not conceal his warm and all but unqualified admiration of the Lord Protector; he passes over the most questionable parts of his procedure with great tenderness, and applauds as the perfection of statesmanship even those acts which his best friends would rather cover under oblivion. But he manifests a thorough acquaintance with the history, and gives such a flattering view of the state of the churches during the short period of Cromwell's rule, that, contrasted with what preceded and followed it, we cannot help regretting that they did not enjoy it longer, or make a better use of it.

Since the above sentences were *printed off* we have received the following authentic account of the issue of the Convention; which we have read with mingled feelings of surprise and delight. Our first thought was to cancel all that we had written; but on second thoughts, we have allowed it to stand. The articles in the *Princeton Review* cannot be cancelled; and these may stand as the honest convictions of good men, not withdrawn or swept away, but overflowed by the rising tide of Christian charity, which thinketh no evil, rejoicing not in iniquity but rejoicing in the truth." Viewed in this light, we hail it as an emphatic and seasonable lesson to the Presbyterian Churches at home. May the same spirit of brotherly love, of mutual conciliation, and of much prevailing prayer be poured out upon us, and the clouds that now darken our horizon may as suddenly be dispelled; and with our fears as quickly disappointed, and our hopes as surprisingly realised, we may be compelled to exclaim, "What hath God wrought!"

A sentence towards the close of the report, in regard to negotiations between the Old and New School Presbyterians, is apt to suggest a suspicion that the question is not yet closed: but after such a scene of blessed agreement, it is hardly possible to imagine that, under the mere formality of holding themselves at liberty to act in their own courts as Providence might direct, any party should contemplate opposition to a Basis of Union *unanimously* accepted by them and their brethren in a Convention of which they formed a part.

"THE UNION QUESTION IN AMERICA.

"The Convention of the various American Presbyterian Churches, which met in Philadelphia on the 5th and 6th November, for the purpose of furthering the cause of Union, has, according to all accounts, been most successful. The *American Presbyterian*, one of the organs of the New School Branch, says it was a success of such magnitude

and character, as overwhelmed its most sanguine friends with surprise, especially since the Old School Church, by its Presbyteries, had taken such an equivocal attitude on re-union with their branch. In numbers it far exceeded their expectations, there being about 820 delegates in all. And the character and ability of these delegates were such that it was declared, by good judges, the ablest body of Presbyterians that had ever convened in America. Drs Hodge, Breckenridge, Musgrave, Davidson, and Monfort, of the Old School; Professor H. B. Smith, Drs Fisher, Stearns, Hatfield, Booth, Duffield Jun., and others, of the New School; Drs Davidson and Harper of the United Presbyterian Church, Dr Wylie of the Reformed Church, with such laymen as Senator Drake of Missouri, and Robert Carter of New York, and George H. Stuart of our city, were sufficient to give high tone and character to the body. An unwonted spirit of prayer was poured out. Fully one-third of the time was spent in devotional exercises of the most delightful character. At every turn in the business—at every point deemed critical, or at any happy conclusion to the deliberations—divine aid was asked, or thanks returned in earnest, spirited, brief utterances. The time thus spent was plainly not lost. It brought the hearts of the members so much nearer together, that they were more thoroughly prepared for this peculiar work of union. It contributed to the deepening of the inner sentiment of unity, so essential to any real organic unity. It blew the flame and heated the materials more nearly to the welding point. The great matter for which the Convention assembled was quickly put in hand, and the rapidity with which the committee matured a platform, which, in the main, proved just what the Convention wanted, was only to be explained as an answer to prayer, and as indicating the maturity and unanimity of sentiment in the body itself. One of not the least results of the meeting has been to bring about a better understanding between many of the leading men of the Old and New School branches. Out of the 320 members present, 180 belonged to the former, and about 90 to the latter. It would appear that the anti-union element in the Old School Presbyteries had no place in the Convention. It was regarded as a novel and instructive spectacle, when staunch Old School men were heard protesting against a proposition coming from the New School side, as needlessly rigorous in its orthodoxy. On the first vote upon the amendment, the Old School was divided, and the New School was unanimously in its favour. When the vote was announced, an Old School brother, who had done his part in the division of '37, exclaimed, "The New School is more orthodox than the Old!" In like manner, on the question of embodying the Catechism in the Basis, the New School voted in favour, and the Old School against it. How, then, could it be otherwise than that, as New School orthodoxy vindicated itself, Old School suspicions declined? Another remarkable feature of the proceedings was, that the overpowering drift of feeling was towards nothing short of organic unity. All propositions looking towards a confederation of independent bodies were received with indifference, or were at once rejected. All the prayers were burdened with desire for organic unity now. A letter was read by Mr G. H. Stuart from the Rev. Dr.

Guthrie, of Edinburgh, pleading powerfully on behalf of union, and referring to the beneficial influence which the consummation of such an event would have on the same cause in Great Britain. After discussing the matter of union from various points of view, the following was adopted as a

BASIS OF UNION,

to be submitted for consideration by the various branches of the Presbyterian Church represented in the Convention :—

I. An acknowledgment of the Old and New Testament to be the inspired Word of God, and the only infallible rule of faith and practice.

II. That in the United Church, the Westminster Confession of Faith shall be received and adopted, as containing the System of Doctrine, taught in the Holy Scriptures ; it being understood that this Confession is received in its proper historical, that is, the Calvinistic or Reformed sense.

• Whilst the Committee recommend the foregoing basis of doctrine, they wish to be understood as recognizing the orthodoxy of the Larger and Shorter Catechisms ; of the Heidelberg Catechism ; and of the canons of the Synod of Dort.

III. That the United Church shall receive and adopt the Presbyterian form of Church Government.

IV. The Book of Psalms, which is of Divine inspiration, is well adapted to the state of the Church in all ages and circumstances, and should be used in the worship of God. Therefore, we recommend that a new and faithful version of the Psalms be provided as soon as practicable. But inasmuch as various collections of Psalmody are used in the different Churches, a change in this respect shall not be required.

The Convention voted by *Churches*, and on the adoption of the basis as a whole, the final vote stood : Old School, unanimous. New School, unanimous. United Presbyterian, ten for, and one against. Reformed Presbyterian, five for, and four against. Reformed Dutch, unanimous. Cumberland Presbyterian, declined voting.

The report was declared adopted by the Churches voting unanimously.

Resolutions were also agreed to, to the effect that a committee be appointed to lay the above basis before the highest Judicatories of the various branches of the Church represented—that all who now voted for the basis should not thereby be regarded as being committed to advocate its adoption when laid before the branches of the Church to which they respectively belong ; but shall be free to act according to the indications of Providence at the time—that by the adoption of the above basis it is not designed to interfere with the pending negotiations for union between two of the larger bodies represented in this Convention—and that as there is so much agreement among the Churches here represented in all essential matters of faith, discipline, and order, it is recommended that friendly and fraternal intercourse be cultivated, by interchange of pulpits, by fellowship with one another in social meetings, and in every other practicable way.

The Convention also adopted resolutions providing for a day of

humiliation and prayer, in view of the divisions in the Presbyterian body (first Thursday in May next), and for the holding of District Conferences for the promotion of the union spirit in various cities. An address to the different branches of the Presbyterian Church, urging the importance and necessity of union, was read and approved. After passing the usual votes of thanks, the Convention adjourned, to meet again in November of the coming year, at Xenia, O.

An event during the Convention which has caused a great stir throughout the country was a visit made to it by a number of Low Church Episcopalian clergy who were in Philadelphia, attending one of the meetings of their Church Society for the Diffusion of Evangelical Knowledge. The deputation was headed by Bishops M'Ilvaine, Lee, and Eastburn, and the Rev. Stephen H. Tyng, of New York, was among their number. Several of them addressed the Convention, and advocated the more frequent commingling of Christians of different denominations.

The Bibliotheca Sacra for October 1867.

This number of the *Bibliotheca* opens with the first of a proposed series of articles by Dr Barrows, late of Andover, on "Revelation and Inspiration." Like many of similar treatises written by our transatlantic divines, it is marked by a thoroughly scientific and elaborate style of treatment. The two terms are well defined and distinguished, and in discussing the false *a priori* assumptions against revelation with which he commences, he disposes, first, of the pantheistic system, and next of Hume's argument against miracles, which he proves to be essentially pantheistic, with a pertinency and force which we have seldom seen equalled. This is followed by an article by Professor Brown of Gettysburgh, on the "Second Advent and the Creeds of Christendom," the object of which is to shew that all these creeds teach a doctrine opposed to that of modern millenarianism. "There is a special propriety," he remarks, "in examining this subject at the present time. The pulpit resounds with the doctrine of Christ's speedy coming to reign in person on the earth. The press teems with publications—volumes, tracts, and occasional sermons—inculcating the same views. Passing events are seized hold of to illustrate and confirm the oracular utterances of the pulpit and the press; and if individuals 'be not shaken in mind, or troubled,' it is from no lack of repeated announcements and warnings." Without entering into the merits of the question, the writer conclusively shews that, weighed on the principle of *quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus*, the millenarian hypothesis must be found wanting. Passing by the theory of Heat, we come to a very learned and exhaustive paper, on the "Authorship and Canonicity of the Epistle to the Hebrews," by Professor Thayer of Andover. On the question of the authorship of the epistle, the writer produces such an immense number of authorities and criticisms *pro* and *con*, and swings us from one side to another with such frequency, as to produce something like mental *vertigo*; but at last he lands in the conclusion that though the canonicity of the epistle is

unquestionable, its authorship is uncertain. For our part, after giving all weight to the opposite opinion that seems justly due to it, we still lean strongly to the belief that its author was no other than the apostle Paul. Into this wide question we cannot now enter. We shall only say, that we consider the judgment of Origen and the Alexandrian Church viewed both as familiar with the language, and as living so near to the times of the apostle, as sufficient to outweigh that of the Latin Church; and that if worthy of a place in the canon, we know no other inspired writer, who, humanly speaking, was capable of writing such an epistle than Paul, who, though specially destined to be the apostle of the Gentiles, was also commissioned by Christ to "bear his name before the children of Israel," and who, as appears from his other epistles, did more, felt more, than all the rest of his brethren for his countrymen the Hebrews. "It avails little to us," as Mr Paxton Hood has so eloquently put it, "that criticism cannot prove the Epistle to the Hebrews to be his. We *know* it must be his. We feel Paul in every line. It is all along his grand logic on fire! his accumulating crowd of images! until they all rush together in their fiery pomp and illumination, at the close, in the altogether unparalleled splendour of expression in the eleventh and twelfth chapters."*

XIII.—CRITICAL NOTICES.

The Power of Zeal. By the Rev. DAVID KING, LL.D. With an Appendix. London: James Nisbet & Co., 21 Berners Street. 1867.

It prepossesses one in favour of this little work to find that it was not thrown off in a hurry. "I do not conceal," says its eminent author, "that the preparation of this small volume has cost me labour." In consequence of this, it is very pleasant reading, rightly directed "labour" on the part of an author, generally smoothing the reader's pathway in no slight degree. The greater part of the volume, including all but the appendix, will be thoroughly intelligible to minds of even limited culture, while the most fastidious intellect will find nothing in the mode of treating the subject to which it can take exception. We should, therefore, rejoice to hear that the volume was extensively circulated among the ordinary membership of the Christian church, without reference to the denomination to which they may belong, or the degree of culture they may possess. It is not without due deliberation that we say—whatever their denomination; for so unsectarian is the spirit of Dr King, and so gentlemanly his language, that no evangelical Christian of any church will find throughout the work a single sentence to grate on his feelings. Underlying this moderation of language is unmistakeable sincerity. The writer speaks gently, because he is fearful of going beyond his convictions; and such an air of reality is in consequence diffused over his whole production, that

* "Lamps, Pitchers, and Trumpets," by E. Paxton Hood.

we should not fear to put it into the hands of one of those worldlings who are so forward to charge Christians with hypocrisy, and await his verdict as to whether or not the writer was sincere. Dr King evidently writes of Christian zeal, because he feels it, and would wish others to feel it too.

The nature and operation of zeal are treated in a way which would do no discredit to a professed mental philosopher; the Scripture illustrations on the subject are novel and striking; and of the anecdotes from modern life, one—that relating to the late Joseph Lume, M.P.—should be copied into the newspapers, and make the tour of the kingdom.

The appendix, which is designed only for persons of culture, consists of three carefully prepared dissertations: the first on the creation of matter, the second on physical suffering and moral government, and the third on the transmutation of species, as recently revived with modifications, by Darwin. Most writers on religious zeal would simply have ignored these subjects; but it is characteristic of our author that he never turns aside from the difficulties which he finds in his path, but measures their magnitude, and does his best to remove them away. Having therefore perceived, as all observant persons recently have done, that scientific speculations are exerting a deadening influence on Christian zeal, he has given careful attention to these speculations themselves, with the view of ascertaining, so far as possible, what consistency they have attained, and what probability exists of their ultimately taking their place with the ascertained truths of science. When a mere theologian ventures on such an inquiry, he treads on very dangerous ground, and incurs imminent risk of a catastrophe. Dr King, however, whose work on Geology and Religion elicited the commendation of Sir Roderick Murchison, has tastes too manifestly scientific to admit of his committing himself to incautious statements; and to make assurance doubly secure, he submitted this part of his work before its publication to eminently scientific friends, who suggested some slight improvements on it, and gave it their imprimatur, though, with characteristic caution, they forbore to endorse it absolutely. It is consequently of great value. As a specimen of this part of the volume, we would adduce Dr King's four arguments against the hypothesis that matter has existed from eternity, and in favour of the scriptural doctrine taught in Heb. xi. 3 and other places—of its true and proper creation. The second and third of these arguments we italicise, feeling that they are calculated to exert an effect on religious minds analogous to and quite as decisive as that produced by the *reductio ad absurdum* in mathematics.

“God made things now seen with no aid from the sensible and perceptible. Simply and absolutely, when they were non-existent, he brought them into existence.”

This sublime view of creation was too high for ancient philosophy. The philosophers held generally, if not unanimously, that *ex nihilo nihil fit*—that out of nothing nothing comes; and therefore, to account for our own corporeal frames and for the world which we inhabit, they alleged the eternity of matter. That this philosophy was less truly philosophical than the Bible will appear, I think, from the following considerations.

1. There is a spirit in man, and omnipotence is needed to bring mind as well as matter out of nonentity. Indeed, Locke considered the creation of mind the greater achievement of the two. He thought “we might be able to aim at some dim and seeming conception how matter might at first be made, and begin to exist by the power of an eternal first Being, but to give beginning and being to a spirit would be found a more inconceivable effect of omnipotent power.” The precise sense of these words Locke has nowhere explained. I quote them only as strongly declaring that minds not divine require creation to account for their being. If, then, minds once not existing have come into existence by creation first, why should

the creation of matter be accounted inadmissible? The only retreat from this objection is in denying the existence of mind apart from matter, and in holding that all mental powers and operations are material attributes. This evasion will not account for that which was not beginning to be. But without prosecuting the disquisition, let us take note, that to deny the possibility of a creation is to disown the existence of created minds, and to resolve all we are into sheer materialism.

"2. *If there be something apart from God and not produced by him, then for so much we have to make no acknowledgment of him. We must then praise him with reservations and exceptions. 'Of him, and to him, and through him are all things.'* No; matter is independent of him, and out of him has all its being.

"3. *If matter was not created, then it has divine attributes. It is underived, self-existent, everlasting, &c. Thus in denying God's creation of matter, we in effect raise up other gods, and every stock or stone becomes a virtual divinity.*

"4. The distinction between matter and the modelling of it is not tenable. The hypothesis is that God found matter existing, and gave it properties and adjustments. Did he then find it without qualities? That is not imaginable. Without solidity, extension, &c., it would not be matter, so far as we can form any apprehension of the facts. But all the qualities which matter has are such as to render it available for use. They all make a good foundation to build upon, and are in perfect keeping with the magnificent superstructure witnessed. But how could there be all this goodness, and fitness, and profitableness without God making them such? If there could be so much excellence without him, why not all excellence? Why not dispense with him altogether, and replace him by the twin tenets of materialism and atheism?"

We feel assured that this well-planned and carefully-executed volume of Dr King's will increase rather than diminish the reputation of its distinguished author, and we trust that it will be found useful for its primary purpose, that of making Christian zeal flame more fiercely where already it exists, and lighting it up in quarters where as yet nothing has appeared but the coldness and the apathy of death.

R. H.

The Theory of Ruling Elderships: or, The Position of the Lay Ruler in the Reformed Churches Examined. By PETER COLIN CAMPBELL, D.D., Principal of the University of Aberdeen. William Blackwood & Sons, Edinburgh and London.

The design of this treatise is to prove that the term *presbyter*, which we have translated elder in the New Testament, uniformly denotes the pastor or minister of the gospel, and is never applied there, or in the language of primitive antiquity, to what we now call *ruling elders*. Dr Campbell disclaims all intention of meddling with the constitution or usage of the Church of Scotland, he pleads for the representation of the laity in her counsels as resting on Scriptural authority, and sees no reason for a departure from her present practice. But, he maintains that the theory of ruling eldership, as that is held in popular works, and, indeed, as generally understood in our Presbyterian Churches, is wholly erroneous and without any foundation, either in Scripture, in the writings of the early church, or even in our own ecclesiastical standards. To the settlement of this question, which we deem of no small importance in the present day, Principal Campbell has brought no small amount of critical acumen and ecclesiastical learning. He seems to have read and closely studied all that has been written on the subject in early and later times; and we have no hesitation

in declaring, that, in our judgment he has fully established his point. After studying the question for years, we confess that we have never been able to satisfy ourselves with the ordinary distinction between *teaching* and *ruling presbyters*, upon which so many of our Scottish writers have attempted to base our ecclesiastical polity. The main and indeed the only passage on which that distinction is made to rest, is that much contested one in 1 Tim. v. 17, “ Let the elders that rule well be counted worthy of double honour, especially they that labour in the word and doctrine.” Our author has, we think, satisfactorily shewn, and his opinion is borne out by the testimony of many of our best critics, that this passage affords no ground for the distinction in question. The true sense he supposes to be this, “ Let the presbyters who preside well be counted worthy of double recompense, especially those who are laborious in preaching and teaching.” We venture to suggest the following as perhaps still better, “ Let the presbyters who rule well, and especially those who are laborious in the word and doctrine, be counted worthy of double recompense.” Dr Campbell’s account of the long controversy regarding this subject in the Westminster Assembly, deserves special consideration. The discussion lasted a month, during which George Gillespie, with the other Scottish Commissioners, endeavoured without success to induce the Assembly to sanction Calvin’s view of the famous passage adopted in the second book of discipline, “ That besides those presbyters that rule well, and labour in the word and doctrine, there be *other presbyters* who especially apply themselves to ruling, though they labour not in the word and doctrine.” “ The discussion,” says Dr Campbell, “ is instructive, and the result remarkable. While the grand committee declare unanimously in favour of the institution of lay rulers in the church, they carefully exclude from their conclusion not merely the term *presbyter*, in reference to lay rulers, but even that of *elder*, as liable to be confounded with “ presbyters,” and refuse to quote 1 Tim. v. 17 in regard to the office.” Accordingly, neither in the Confession of Faith, nor in the “ Form of Church Government,” are the terms *presbyter* or *elder* so applied. In the former, a Synod is described as composed of ministers and *other fit persons*.” The Principal is very hard, and not without reason, on the theory of Dr Miller of Princeton, who, “ while he assumes, in the most extraordinary manner, the *senioris plebis* to be presbyters, also assumes all the presbyters mentioned as existing in the early churches by Clement of Rome, Ignatius, Polycarp, Hippolytus, and others, to have been mere ruling elders, or members of session, in the face of the abundant evidence that they were ministers of the word and sacraments, and in oversight of the absurd consequence which must follow from his view, that even in the largest cities, in which there was but one church and bishop, there was no other minister of the word and sacraments but the bishop alone. In this double begging of the question—unheard of, we believe, till this time—he has been followed by one or two popular writers.”

The theory advocated by Principal Campbell is valuable, whether regarded in its polemical or in its practical bearings. It places the argument for presbyterial rule on higher vantage ground, as opposed both to the prelatical and the congregational model. On the assumption that presbyters is a name given in the New Testament indiscriminately to ministers and “ ruling elders,” the advocate of Presbytery cannot consistently appeal to Acts xx., in proof that “ the elders of Ephesus ” were to act as “ bishops ” (*episcopountes*), without being driven to the admission that the “ ruling elders ” among them were bishops also, and that all the rules given in the epistles to Timothy and Titus, for those holding “ the office of a bishop,” must be binding upon them. Dr Campbell’s theory is that in the larger cities there were several congregations, but one church, governed by the presbytery of pastors, associated with certain of the brethren as assessors,

and presided over by one of their number, who was *primus inter parès*, and was subsequently styled *bishop* by way of eminence. Dr Miller's theory, on the other hand, resolves itself into congregationalism, or rather congregational prelacy. The primitive bishop would in this case be placed above the presbyters in point of order, and might speak of "my presbyters," as the modern Presbyterian minister speaks of "my elders." No such phrase, we maintain, as "the bishop and *his* presbyters, or *his* clergy," occurs in the earlier records of the church, till worldly ambition stepped in to derange the spiritual brotherhood of the presbyters.

We recommend the serious perusal of this treatise to our Presbyterian brethren in England. As for Scotland, we fear that the name "ruling elder" has become so stereotyped as to defy all attempts to supersede it; but why should the cause of presbytery in England be embarrassed by a theory which, as Dr Campbell has shewn, is "repudiated by its most learned friends as unjustified by Scripture, and antiquity, which lays it open to the charge of straining the word of God, and which, by involving it in confusion, contradiction, and absurdity, shakes its very foundations." It is a remarkable fact, that when presbytery was set up as the established form in London in the year 1646, the churches were all supplied with ministers, but the great difficulty lay in procuring persons to act as "ruling elders." In most of the churches none could be found willing to occupy the ambiguous position of a layman invested with a quasi-ministerial office, by an act of formal "ordination," and obliged by solemn vows to discharge spiritual duties for which, though willing to serve the church as a ruler, he felt himself totally unqualified. The idea of a lay presbyter presents to the English mind something quite incongruous, and we feel persuaded that it operates more than many of our friends imagine in preventing the spread of presbytery in England. In regard to the mode of electing lay rulers, which Dr Campbell, proceeding on the Act of Assembly 1642, is inclined to vest in the existing session, we have only to remark that if they are, as he allows, the *seniores plebis*, some link seems necessary to connect them with the people whom they represent; and we fear that in those days of extended suffrage in the state, the people will not rest contented with the old rule, nor will the worthy persons selected, it may be by those already in office, be always willing to act without some declared acceptance of them as rulers on the part of the congregation.

Sketches of Scripture Characters. By the Rev. ANDREW THOMSON, D.D.
Edinburgh: Johnston, Hunter, & Co.

The author of these sketches possesses as a thinker, in a high degree and in happy combination, the qualities which are indispensable to skill and success in this kind of moral portraiture. He is at home in the keen and penetrating analysis of character; he looks below the surface; and knows how to lay bare, and to delineate in vivid colours, the hidden motives—whether virtuous or vicious—which prompted to certain actions, and resulted in the formation of a corresponding class of habits. At the same time, he looks on every scene which he describes, and every personage whom he portrays, with the eye of an artist, and gives strict attention to the rules of perspective in composition—bringing what is important into the foreground and giving it prominence, while placing what is subordinate and trivial in shadow, or leaving it unnoticed. Hence the pleasing impression, and the telling power of his pictures. You feel that every "sketch" is complete—culminating, like the flower of a graceful plant, in some weighty religious truth or moral lesson; that nothing is overdone,—yet, that nothing is wanting to produce the desired effect.

There is a class of writers who carry along with them the sweet fragrance of the pleasant flowers beside which they have lovingly lingered in their walks through the garden of literature. Our author is eminently one of these. While in this, as in his other works which we have examined, he gives the results of independent and original thought, he every now and then lends an additional charm to his own course of illustration by the introduction of some quaint, beautiful, and memorable saying from one of his favourite authors. Gems from worthy old Thomas Fuller, Bishop Hall, and Leighton, sparkle on many a page of this volume; and the reader always feels that they are judiciously chosen, and most appositely placed. If they are not "goads" to wound, they are "nails" to fasten and be remembered.

The New Testament characters embraced in the volume are Simeon, John the Baptist, the daughter of Herodias, the woman with the alabaster box, Pontius Pilate, Simon the Cyrenian, Dorcas, and Mary the mother of John Mark. Those taken from the Old Testament are the Hebrew Maid, Naaman, Gehazi, Nehemiah, and Absalom.

It will be seen from this enumeration of the subjects embraced in this portrait gallery, that they are very various; affording scope for the exercise of the author's versatile power in holding up to view the precious for imitation, and exhibiting the vile as beacon-lights to warn against danger and sin in those forms which are brought under review. Evangelical truth and practical duty are treated here, not in the dry and unattractive manner of abstract statement or didactic disquisition, but in connection with the narrative of stirring incidents and the portraiture of living character. As spoken in the pulpit—if we may suppose that they passed this ordeal—they must have been instructive and impressive in no common degree; and in their present shape they form a truly delightful volume, admirably adapted for Sabbath evening reading in families. We feel, on laying down the work, that we know the personages described better than we did before perusing it; and that we have a clearer understanding than before of the places which they hold in the biographies of Scripture.

An extract or two will, we are sure, give our readers a pleasing impression of the style of the work.

Referring to the value and influence of early religious instruction as illustrated in the case of the captive Hebrew Maid, whom the story of Naaman so touchingly introduces to our notice, our author says,—

"It has sometimes happened that religious instructions which appeared to leave no marked impression at the moment, have begun to germinate in future years and in foreign lands. The gathered fuel upon the altar has been suddenly wrapt in living flame by fire from heaven. It is a fine thought of the poet-philosopher Richter, that the first colours which are painted on the mind are usually immortal. The first mountain that we have seen, the first strain of music that we have heard, the first look that we have had of the solemn sea, are never forgotten. Ply then your blessed work, ye who are parents. . You now paint in undying colours. Your work shall have eternal issues. From their childhood let your little ones know 'the holy Scriptures, which are able to make them wise unto salvation?'

'The clay is moist and soft; now, now, make haste,
And form the pitcher, for the wheel runs fast.'"

Speaking of the courage of the Baptist, as one of the excellences which formed his moral greatness in the sight of the Lord, Dr Thomson says,—

"It must be evident that the state of society among the Jews when John appeared was such that he needed for his work an extraordinary measure of moral intrepidity. He found them divided into two great and powerful religious parties: on the one hand the Pharisees, who were formal without

being devout; punctilious about trifles, but disregarding of the weightier matters of the law; impatient of opposition, and malignantly resentful against every one that questioned their authority; proud of their descent from Abraham, as constituting them a sort of peerage of the human race, and confiding in it as their sure passport to heaven: and, on the other hand, the Sadducees, who were the rationalists of their times; sceptical, not from their love of truth, but from indifference to it; affecting a proud intellectualism in their conversation, but self-indulgent and sensual in their lives. It evidently required one from whose breast the fear of God had driven out every other fear, to step forth from his wilderness, a solitary witness for God, and confront these dominant sectaries and their leaders; and, unbacked by popular support or influence of any kind, without apology or compromise, in plain, unvarnished words, to tell them of their danger, their duties, and their sins.

"But the brave preacher was equal to his task. Hear how he seeks to awaken the Pharisee from his self-satisfied dream, by addressing him in these words of unwonted fidelity: 'Think not to say within yourselves, that ye have Abraham for your father; for I say unto you, that God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham.' And when he passes up from the banks of the Jordan to the court of the Galilean tetrarch, royal crime finds no shelter from the shafts of his stern rebuke. The frowns of Herod cannot terrify him, nor his caresses and flatteries make him prophesy smooth things; nor can they turn aside for a moment the bolt which he has made ready for the incestuous ruler, 'It is not lawful for thee to have thy brother's wife.' Nor is he less faithful and fearless when addressing the vast multitudes of the common people, as they came streaming from all quarters of the land to the banks of Jordan to his baptism. Our Lord himself specially notices the fact that he was no supple or pliant moralist, accommodating himself to the popular prejudices, and trimming his sails to catch the current of human applause, with the view of turning it to base and selfish ends. He was no 'reed shaken with the wind.' But aware of the corrupt and worldly motives that had borne the greater number of them into his presence, he denounced them as a brood of serpents, a 'generation of vipers,' and called them to choose between immediate repentance and early and awful retribution. . . . As soon might you have moved the sun in the heavens from his course, as have turned from his duty this stern reformer, standing in God's name with the winnowing fan of his ministry of repentance. Such moral intrepidity, as 'among innumerable incorrupt he stood,' was a spectacle for angels, and made him 'great in the sight of the Lord.'"

After a searching and able analysis of the character of Pontius Pilate, in which he stands before us the very type of religious incredulity, and a remarkable example of that moral indecision which springs from the want of religious principle, we have the following weighty sentences on the honest and loving search of truth:—

"No one ever put the question, in a truth-loving spirit, which Pilate had now spoken with sceptical indifference, 'What is truth?' and failed to find it. 'I being in the way, the Lord led me.' 'The meek will he guide in judgment.' To direct the mind of the Ethiopian treasurer as he rides in his chariot through the desert of Gaza, and reads in the dim page of Old Testament prophecy, Philip, the evangelist, is supernaturally borne to his side, and, joining himself to the inquirer, brings the truth to light. Peter is commanded by a vision and a heavenly voice to hasten from Joppa to Cesarea, that he may instruct another earnest truth-seeker in the person of the Gentile Cornelius. Sooner than allow those venerable Magi to lose their way, who have come from the far-distant east in search of Christ, a new star is created to guide their steps to his lowly resting-place."

There is a grievous Pyrrhonism at work in our own age, which tends to enfeeble all religious life; for how can there be strong life where the soul is not rooted and grounded in those truths which God has given to sustain and nourish it? We have passed from the extreme of bigotry to that of a universal hesitancy, which holds not even the most precious truths with the grasp of a firm conviction; and while men of a former age used carnal weapons to propagate truth, there is a strange readiness in our days to shake hands with error, and to sit down and try to live upon its husks. But we cannot find peace in doubting. Our minds were as certainly made to enjoy truth, as the eye was formed to enjoy light. And only let us be willing to allow God to guide us, and be ready to make any sacrifices to find truth, and to follow its light after we have found it, and he will not leave us to stumble on the dark mountains, or to fall among the tombs. Soon he will set our feet upon a rock, and we shall begin to taste the serene joy of 'a soul reposing in assured belief.' For, as the greatest of English thinkers has said, 'the inquiry of truth, which is the love-making or wooing of it,—the knowledge of truth, which is the presence of it,—and the belief of truth, which is the enjoying of it,—is the sovereign good of human nature. It is heaven upon earth to have a man's mind move in charity, rest in providence, and turn upon the poles of truth.'

The Divine Glory of Christ. By CHARLES J. BROWN, D.D. Edinburgh T. Nelson & Sons. 1868.

We have perused this little work with high and unalloyed satisfaction. "My design in this little volume," says the amiable and excellent author, "has been to accomplish two objects in combination—first, to contribute somewhat that might not be altogether without value theologically, in the Socinian, and some other controversies; and second, so to do this as to promote, at the same time, the edification of the devout reader." This twofold object has been effected in a style at once pleasing and powerful. Dr Brown deals, not with the direct and outstanding proofs of our Lord's deity, but with those that are incidental and implied. These evidences of his divine glory, though they can hardly be termed undesigned, are yet latent and unexpected; and, like scintillations or meteoric splendours shooting athwart the sky, affect us with a feeling of delightful surprise. In his second chapter, more especially, the author has started an argument against Unitarians, drawn from the unity of God, a doctrine of which they boast themselves the only consistent upholders,—an argument which, as handled by Dr Brown, is, we think, fresh and untrodden. Altogether, the volume will be found as conducive to the comfort of the devout believer, as it is fitted to dispel the doubts and consolidate the faith of every reader.

Scenes and Characters in a Scottish Pastorate. By the Rev. J. R. M'GAVIN, D.D., Dundee. London: James Nisbet & Co., 22 Berners Street. Edinburgh: W. Oliphant & Co. 1866.

This book, with its unpretending title, is of very great value in many ways. It is a study of human nature in its wonderful relations to Christian truth and life; it is a contribution to the evidences of the divinity of the gospel, in its power to reach and influence, as nothing else can, all kinds of ignorance, sin, and sorrow; it is a handbook of cases for a Christian minister, standing to him in the place which clinical lectures hold to the study of medicine. Many books, from Herbert's "Priest to the Temple," down to Paxton Hood's "Trumpets, Lamps, and Pitchers," have been

written on the work of a pastor ; but a book such as this gives, not rules, but experiments put before the reader—the thing done, rather than the method of doing it.

We do not wonder that a man like Dr M'Gavin of Dundee should have written this book, and done it so well. A long experience in a most fertile field, and a rare combination of shrewdness, sympathy, and earnestness, have given him endless stores from which to gather these cases, which, we trust, will be followed by a farther gleanings. We are bound to say, from thorough knowledge, that few men in any denomination exercise, at this time, a more human, earnest, persuasive ministry than Dr M'Gavin. This book, as one might expect, is remarkably interesting. Varied observation, insight, pathos, humour,—the essential interest of the situation described,—gleams now and again of fine fancy, constant warmth of Christian-like love for souls,—pictures of life in deplorable depths, and in noble elevations,—these are all here.

Some of the chapters are specially impressive. That entitled "Princes of the People," might well be printed by itself, and distributed among the working classes. We can unfeignedly say that a second reading of this book has only made us determine to read it still oftener ; and so we heartily commend it to all, and specially to ministers entering upon their work.

Notices of the following works, which were in type, have been unavoidably deferred, from want of space, till our next number, viz.,

Lectures on Early Scripture, by H. F. Crosse ; The Philosophy of Evangelism ; Lamps, Pitchers, and Trumpets, by E. Paxton Hood ; Imaginism and Rationalism, by John Vickers.

The following works have come to hand too late to be noticed in this number, viz.,

History of Israel to the Death of Moses, by Ewald ; Parting Counsels, by the Rev. John Allan ; Thoughts on Reading the Bible, by Thoms ; Life of Pastor Fleidner ; Coming Events and Present Duties, by the Rev. C. J. Ryle ; The Work of God in Every Age, by the Rev. W. Froggat ; Devout Thoughts by Deep Thinkers, by Susan Coalbank ; Short Family Readings for Sundays ; Pastoral Counsels, by the late Dr Robertson of Glasgow ; The Holy Child, and other Poems, by Stephen Jenner ; Joel : a Translation in Metrical Parallelisms, by Adam Clarke Rowley ; Truths for the Times, &c. ; Light and Truth, by Dr Horatius Bonar ; A Being Filled with the Spirit, by John Goodwin ; The Life and Reign of King David, by Dr G. Smith ; Memoirs of Olivet, by Dr Macduff ; Pulpit Echoes, by Dr Macfarlane ; Home Sundays, by the Rev. George Everard ; Life of Stonewall Jackson, abridged from Professor Dabney : The Pulpit Assistant, vol. II. ; The Increase of Faith, &c., &c.

BRITISH AND FOREIGN EVANGELICAL REVIEW.

APRIL 1868.

ART. I.—*The Swedish Reformation.*

1. *Swenska Kyrkans Historia.* Af Dr H. REUTERDAHL. Fjerde Bandet. Sverige under Konung Gustaf I. Lund, 1866. (History of the Swedish Church. By Dr H. Reuterdaahl. Fourth Volume. Sweden under Gustavus the First. Lund, 1866.)
2. *Swenska Kyrkoreformationens Historia. I tre afdelningar.* Af L. A. ANJOU. Upsala, 1850. (History of the Reformation in Sweden. In three divisions. By L. A. Anjou. Upsala, 1850.)

IN a previous article* we were privileged to trace the deeply interesting history of the Swedish Reformation from its earliest commencement until the election of Laurentius Petri to the metropolitan see of Upsala in 1531. Following, for the main part, the guidance of Bishop Anjou,† in his learned and singularly lucid work, we pursued the path of ecclesiastical reform, through all its various turns and windings, and saw it at last emerge upon the broad and firm platform of a total, or almost total, severance from the communion of the Romish Church. With the elevation of Laurentius Petri to archiepiscopal rank, as remarked at the close of our previous paper, there begins a new era in the ecclesiastical annals of Sweden. The extreme energy and ability of the youthful metropolitan—who, although young in years, was old in wisdom and in knowledge of the world—were required to consolidate the freshly-reared Protestant fabric, and impart to it the

* *British and Foreign Evangelical Review* for July 1867.

† Professor Anjou, it may be stated, is now, and has for some time been, bishop of the diocese of Wisby in Southern Sweden.

strength and permanence of which it stood so much in need. At this date, 1531, the Swedish church had indeed fully organised itself, retaining the ancient constitution, yet independent of, and separate from, the Papal system, of which it had formed an integral part for ages. It possessed bishops who wrought zealously in behalf of the reformed doctrines; and in the reigning monarch, with his unquestioned Protestant leanings, it enjoyed a warm friend and an influential protector. But in many respects the state of matters was still the reverse of stable. No fixed form of creed had been adopted; the Augsburg Confession of the German Protestants is not so much as named in any record of the transactions of the period; and the old code of ecclesiastical law remained in a chaotic condition, being neither held formally binding to its former extent, nor formally abrogated in all or even some of its details. Much, therefore, was still left to be done; and with characteristic fervour the king and the new archbishop addressed themselves to the herculean task of consolidation. Olaus Petri, too, the brother of Laurentius, was no less active, and continued that career of authorship which had so largely contributed to the successful progress of the protestant cause. In 1535 he published two works,—the one a treatise on justification, in which he discusses this important subject with his usual force and clearness, and in conformity with the generally-received opinions of the evangelical church,—and the other, a commentary on the tenth chapter of Matthew's gospel, designed in special manner for the times, and exhorting believers to steadfastness in the midst of persecution. Along with various compilations of psalms and spiritual songs, they were the last of Olof's writings in the reformed cause, and, like his earlier literary labours, lent a mighty stimulus to the progress of the principles they were designed to benefit. Laurentius Petri himself, notwithstanding his numerous public avocations, found time to appear as an author a year or two afterwards, in 1538. His first production related to a comparatively unimportant subject—the use of consecrated water—a practice which he unequivocally condemns. More onerous studies were then, however, in his few leisure moments, occupying his thoughts; and the fruit of them was soon to ripen in a completed translation of the Bible,—part of which, the Psalter, was ere long published, along with a version, in Swedish, of the Athanasian creed. Thus, as in other lands, during the earlier portion of reformation history, administrative genius and literary talent wrought side by side in unison for the accomplishment of the one common end.

We now come to a singular, and no less obscure than singular, episode in the history of Swedish Protestantism. We

allude to the breach between Gustavus and his two firm friends and supporters, Laurentius Andreæ and Olaus Petri, hitherto the foremost champions of the Reformation. The circumstances connected with this event are sufficiently mysterious; and but little light has, in our estimation, been thrown upon them in the pages of the Swedish historians. Bishop Anjou's account of the incident in question is, without doubt, more perspicuous than any we have hitherto seen; yet even *his* version of the trial and condemnation of Laurentius and Olof is far from satisfactory. It will ever be difficult, we suspect, to form aught like a true idea of all the causes which led to so sweeping and startling a change in the relations which had hitherto subsisted between the king and his two faithful counsellors and friends. But it would appear that about the year 1538 the mind of Gustavus had become partly alienated from both Olof and Laurentius, by reason of various minor incidents—none of them individually of any special importance, but when combined capable of unfavourably influencing a character such as that of the Swedish sovereign.* Gustavus was on the point of developing those Erastian tendencies which afterwards not seldom brought him into lamentable collision with the ecclesiastical authorities of the kingdom over which he ruled. The tendencies to which we refer were fostered by the arrival in Sweden of the adventurer Conrad Peutinger or Pyhy, who acquired considerable influence at court,—and still further when another stranger, George Norman, recommended by Luther and Melancthon as tutor to the king's son, the young Duke Eric, ere long became the chief adviser of Gustavus in all matters appertaining to ecclesiastical reform and the consolidation of the church. Doubtless the monarch experienced in Olof and Laurentius unflinching opponents to his new-born zeal for a more radical reformation, and to his semi-Erastian or wholly Erastian schemes; while it is certain that Norman and Pyhy (especially the former) were prime instigators of, and actors in, the surprising and melancholy events which shortly followed. On these events we cannot here enlarge. Suffice it to say that at the close of 1539 a judicial process was instituted against both Laurentius

* Bishop Anjou and other historians lay too much stress, in our opinion, on Olof's "*Predikan emot de grufveliga eder och Guds försmädelse*" (Sermon against hideous oaths and blasphemies of God's name), published in 1539, and in which the preacher vigorously attacked the practice of profane swearing, then carried to excess among the Swedes—not obscurely hinting at the monarch himself as a chief sinner in this respect. Doubtless the bolt struck home, and galled Gustavus to the quick; but, had it not been for the concurrence of other circumstances, the king's natural magnanimity would, we think, have revolted at the thought of punishing so severely the author of the righteous and well-merited rebuke.

Andreæ and Olaus Petri, in which they were accused of sundry treasonable crimes. The articles of impeachment are too long to enumerate; but the reader may credit us when we affirm that they exclusively bear the character of vamped-up charges,—accusations either of the most trivial nature, or destitute of any basis in truth. Notwithstanding, on the 2d January 1540, the two were found guilty, and sentence of death pronounced against them. Intercession, however, being made with the king in their behalf, their lives were spared, in consideration of the payment of heavy fines, which, in the case of Olof, were raised for him by his friends at Stockholm, but in that of Laurentius, who had no resource but his private income, nearly absorbed his entire fortune. The whole mysterious transaction has left a dark stain of ingratitude on the character of Gustavus Vasa; and so keenly was his father's unjust and ungenerous conduct felt by his son and successor, Charles the Ninth, that he expunged from Tegel's "History of Gustavus" the narrative of the proceedings against Laurentius and Olof, out of filial regard for his illustrious parent's memory.

Having thus effectually removed the chief obstacles to his new ecclesiastical plans, the king,—urged on and assisted by George Norman and by Pyhy,—whom he had now made his chancellor,—lost no time in putting them into execution. In the August of 1539, he had already issued an edict appointing the former of the two "Superintendent" of the Swedish Church, with full power over bishops, deans, and all other ranks and degrees of the clergy. This was followed by the establishment of a semi-presbyterian system of church government, which reduced the existing episcopal rank and authority to a mere empty name; and, in a word, virtually subverted the "recess" and "ordinances" of Vesterdaas. By a stroke of the sovereign's pen, the entire ecclesiastical constitution of the realm was radically changed; and the transformation was declared to be the result solely of his own good will and pleasure. Gustavus declared himself empowered, by right of the royal office, to exercise full influence in the regulation of ecclesiastical affairs. Hardly a vestige of their former spiritual functions was left in the hands of the bishops; and it only remained for the king to complete the metamorphosis by abolishing the episcopal order altogether, and declaring, in common with the German Protestants, that the government of the church exclusively appertained to the temporal power, which had the same right to decide concerning matters of Christian faith and worship, as about the affairs of ordinary secular legislation. Now, with regard to the propriety of such a step on the part of the Swedish monarch and his advisers, there can, we should fancy, be but one opinion. It was a political mistake of the grossest kind. Presbyterians

ourselves, we of course believe,—in opposition to Bishop Anjou, whose occasional outbreaks against the system of Presbyterian polity deface certain portions of his work, but which we willingly pardon in consideration of its great and remarkable general merits,—that had Presbyterianism, *from the first*, formed the mould in which was cast the youthful Protestant church of Sweden, it would have been all the better for that church during the successive periods of her history, and all the better for the religious state of the Swedish people at the present day. But to thrust Presbyterianism, either in perfect or imperfect shape, down the throat of a reluctant nation, is surely at once a blunder and a crime. To Episcopalianism the Swedes had been accustomed in the old days of Rome's supremacy, and when the Reformation occurred, the Protestant church, in accordance with their tastes and habits, and, in fine, with the whole genius of the people, assumed the external aspect of the ancient system, and, in this guise, rooted itself firmly in the popular esteem. Nor should it be forgotten that, to the Swedish bishops of the period, belongs the credit of a noble struggle with the Erastianism of Gustavus and his successors on the throne, a struggle in which, notwithstanding their dislike to prelacy, *Scottish* Presbyterians, at all events, can fully sympathise with them, and a struggle, moreover, which was so far successful as to keep, for a lengthened period, the church in Sweden more pure from the despotic control of the state than in any other land where Lutheranism prevailed. Be this, however, as it may, the new ecclesiastical principles were speedily—at least to some extent—for a time reduced to practice. Norman visited, as superintendent, the districts of Vestergötland, Östergötland, and Vermland, in order to inaugurate the new regime, and also to enforce the surrender of the remaining property of the church into the hands of the sovereign. For, simultaneously with the change of ecclesiastical polity, a royal edict had announced that all the treasure, in the shape of gold and silver vessels, &c., possessed by the different places of worship in the kingdom (except what was absolutely necessary for divine service), should be forthwith delivered over to the crown. A minute description is given by Bishop Anjou of the amount of pillage which was thus gathered in from the various religious edifices throughout the country. We use the word pillage advisedly, because it seems to us fitly to apply to the whole circumstances of the case. In 1524–7, Gustavus acted with perfect wisdom and justice in laying an assessment upon the church's property, and applying the superfluous ecclesiastical possessions to relieve the pressing necessities of the state ; but these necessities no longer to such extent existed, and the sovereign, without asking, as before, the

advice of his council, and acting in the spirit of pure autocracy, here at once proceeded to the appropriation, for his own behoof, of the remaining temporal treasures of the church,—a church, moreover, not now popish, but reformed. Like the ungenerous trial of Laurentius Andreæ and Olaus Petri, this transaction has cast a dark shadow over the reign of the great founder of the Vasa dynasty ; and all impartial Swedish historians concur in lamenting and condemning it.

It is pleasant to pass from these gloomy episodes in the annals of the Swedish Reformation, to the more purely spiritual aspects of the Protestant cause, and the triumphs which, at the present period, it was slowly, yet surely, gaining. One of the most notable incidents that marked its progress, was the publication of the Swedish Bible in 1541. Laurentius Petri, since his elevation to the see of Upsala, had laboured unweariedly for the furtherance of this good work, and at last experienced the satisfaction of seeing his efforts crowned with complete success. It was he who superintended the translation, and mainly executed it, although he speaks of others being associated with himself, in all likelihood his brother Olof, Laurentius Andreæ, and Bishop Bothvid of Strengnäs. The expenses were defrayed out of the revenues of the church, the proceeds of the archdeaconry of Upsala being applied to this purpose ; and, in addition, each parish in the kingdom was commanded to furnish the value of a measure of “pure and weighty” grain (an ecclesiastical tax still existing, curiously enough, in Sweden, under the name of *Bibeltryckstunna*, or “Bible printing measure,” although devoted to an altogether different object), in order that the publication of the new version of the Scriptures might be speedily and satisfactorily completed. As regards the merits of the translation, they are unquestionably of a high order. The meaning of the original is rendered alike faithfully and perspicuously, while the language is the purest and most elegant Swedish to be found in any work of the time. With very few alterations, this version of the Scriptures is that which is still used in the services of the Swedish church. Its first appearance marks an epoch in the history of the Reformation, an epoch from which may be dated all-important moral and spiritual results. Beneath, also, the political convulsions and violent ecclesiastical changes of the period, such as the various insurrectionary movements which not seldom disturbed the reign of Gustavus I., and his ill-advised attempts despotically to remodel the entire constitution of the Swedish church, there flowed a strong current of prosperity and progress, that at once proved the firm hold which the principles of the Reformation had taken on the mass of the Swedish people, and afforded a happy omen of final triumph to be acquired

over every opposing foe. Doubtless, there were still, in remote districts of the country, numerous adherents of the old religion, and Rome had never relaxed her efforts to regain the sceptre of spiritual dominion which, in Sweden, with the election of Gustavus Vasa to the throne, and the formal embodiment of Protestantism in the constitution of the new monarchy, seemed to have fallen from her grasp; yet the popular affections were now enlisted in behalf of the reformed cause, and so henceforth it marched on conquering and to conquer.

But we must hasten to the death of Gustavus, which occurred in September 1560. Notwithstanding the grievous occasional errors and transgressions of his reign, this great monarch lays undoubted claim to the gratitude of posterity, and especially of the Swedish people. By the latter the meed of thankfulness has been duly paid. Sweden still reverts, in legend and in song, to that momentous epoch when her deliverer appeared, when

“Gustaf Vasa
Sag tyrannen rasa,
Slet en blodig spira ur dess klor,”*

and founded a royal house which, in after centuries, so wonderfully aggrandised the glory of her name. For, with little exaggeration, it may be affirmed that modern Swedish history was in large measure the work of the Vasa dynasty; *that* dynasty politically created Sweden, and made her, at least on two remarkable occasions, the arbiter of the destinies of Europe. All know how the Vasa genius and valour, which the first monarch of the family in such marked measure possessed, flamed forth with surpassing splendour in Gustavus Adolphus and in Charles XII.—the latter no mere soldier-lunatic, as represented by the shallow historians of the past, but a profound and far-seeing politician, worthy to be set side by side with the royal hero-statesman who baffled Wallenstein, and saved from death the liberties of Germany. Bishop Anjou remarks, in words alike true and graceful, when referring to the decease of the first founder of the house, that “at the beginning of the Reformation, its progress could not but in large measure depend upon the personal character of the princes who espoused it. During the long reign of Gustavus I., it was supported in Sweden by his powerful hand, which he extended to this work with the full conviction that it was the triumph of Christ’s kingdom which was thereby advanced. In the course of this period Protestantism by degrees developed itself so far as to

* “Gustaf Vasa
Saw the tyrant ravage,
Tore a bloody sceptre from his grasp.”—*Bellman*.

discern the need of organisation in the form of a self-subsistent church. Such a development was not, indeed, completed before the sovereign's death, since as yet, on account of the conclusions of the Council of Trent, and the more vigorous efforts of the order of the Jesuits to secure the tottering dominion of the Vatican, all hope of the restoration of the church's unity had not wholly died away. Therefore Gustavus I. did not finally accomplish the Swedish Reformation ; for he would not be a reformer *himself*, as afterwards was John the Third, but was, and continued to be, a *disciple* of the reformers ; and the unequal steps he took, ever more firmly and securely, on the path of the Reformation, denoted his own ever-increasing confidence in those Protestant principles which he himself confessed, and, as the father of his subjects, strove to introduce among them. The exceptions that may be taken to his motives and procedure, find partly their apology in the undetermined rights and obligations of the transition period during which he lived, and partly in the imperfection from which no human greatness is ever entirely free. Nor should they prevent the Swedish heart from venerating his memory, so long as we yet enjoy the light and freedom, for which he battled, and which, in his days, began to dawn upon our Swedish fatherland."

The remains of the great king were interred, amid all outward signs of public mourning, in the cathedral of Upsala, and his eldest son, under the title of Eric the Fourteenth, ascended the vacant throne. But Eric lacked the abilities and virtues of his father. His education, indeed, had been carefully attended to, and he was skilled in the various accomplishments of the age ; yet he wanted solidity of mind, and his restless and violent temper, that often seemed to verge upon insanity, involved him in constant troubles, and at length deprived him of his kingdom. What forms a specially interesting feature of Eric's reign, in connection with our present subject, is the struggle between Lutheranism and Calvinism in Sweden, which terminated, as might readily be anticipated, in the final victory of the former. Already, during the life of Gustavus, some of Calvin's followers had arrived in the kingdom, foremost among whom was Dionysius Beurreus, one of Duke Eric's tutors, of whose previous history nothing is known with certainty, except that by birth he was a Frenchman, and about the year 1537 had studied at the Sorbonne in Paris.* Many other Calvinists of different occupations had also emigrated to Sweden, partly to advance their worldly interests,

* Beurreus was afterwards raised to the rank of knight and senator by his former pupil ; but in 1567 the capricious Eric commanded him to be put to death.

partly to escape persecution in the lands of their nativity. Of these a large proportion were from France and England. Just about the time of the third nuptials of Gustavus, in Vadstena, some tumults broke out there, originating in a burst of strong anti-papal feeling, and in which the images and pictures yet remaining in the cloister-church were mutilated or destroyed. These tumults were ascribed, rightly or wrongly, to the Calvinists among the king's musicians, and the fact that Gustavus neglected to punish their misdeeds occasioned scarcely less irritation than did the conduct of the guilty parties. Calvin himself is reported to have written to the Swedish monarch in 1559, to bespeak a favourable consideration of his doctrines.* The two elder sons of Gustavus, who were among the most accomplished persons of the time, were reported to have Calvinistic leanings, acquired by Eric from his instructor Beurres, and by John through his sojourn in England during 1559 and 1560, when he had been favourably impressed with the writings of Calvin, with which he there became acquainted. Upon Eric's accession to the crown, the stricter Protestant party among the Lutherans, with which party the Calvinists at the beginning coalesced, anticipated therefrom much greater progress in the work of reformation. When the new sovereign, like his father before him, invited foreigners to settle in his kingdom, this was done by the letters-patent which he issued in 1561, and through Beurres, who the same year was sent to England, distributed in that country,—letters-patent which contained, indeed, the reservation that all such foreigners should profess the pure Christian faith as it was embodied in the Holy Scriptures, and that they should refrain from disseminating heresy or seducing the minds of the people from the existent religion of the land; but so long as the Swedish Church possessed no definite symbolical standards, it was impossible, with any accuracy, to decide what might constitute a breach of these conditions. The same year, at the Diet of Arboga, a series of questions relating to external ecclesiastical

* In Beza's edition of Calvin's correspondence, however, there is no such epistle, nor any indication of Calvin's relations with Sweden or its sovereign. In a letter sent to Archbishop Laurentius Petri, in 1559, by a Swede, Martimus Olai, then travelling in France and Switzerland, there occurs the following amusing and suggestive passage,—amusing, as evidencing the writer's strong Lutheran prejudice against the great Genevan Reformer, and suggestive, as proving, by its very extravagance, the veneration with which he was regarded by his contemporaries:—"Quidam tanti faciunt Calvinum, ut dicere non vereantur, non posse illum in aliquo errare, eo quod Spiritum Sanctum habeat, quod mihi pontificium quiddam redolere videtur." Was Calvin, we may justly ask, the exclusive object of this exaggerated hero-worship, and did it not find a counterpart in the almost deification of Luther by some of his extreme followers and admirers?

ceremonial were propounded by the king to the clergy, which proved that his inclinations were wavering between Lutheranism and Calvinism ; and a year later, at Stockholm, he again interrogated the assembled priests and bishops with regard to certain disputed articles of faith and practice. Laurentius Petri, in virtue of his high office, now felt himself called upon to interfere, and take a leading part in the discussions that ensued. The freedom of the church in general, and the Lutheran doctrine of the Eucharist, were the chief points which enlisted the powerful support of the metropolitan. Such a support he was the more impelled to grant, inasmuch as, according to Bishop Anjou, whose words are not without a certain truthful basis : “ He was led by internal conviction to shun the freedom that arrogated the name evangelical, but exhibited its opposition to the popish reverence for the sacrament by its professors standing, while the solemnity was going on, with covered head or averted countenance, or engaged in conversation with others near them, in order to shew their complete regardlessness.” Archbishop Laurentius threw down the gauntlet by the publication of two works in 1562,—the first of which advocates the practice of exorcism in baptism, and the second expressly rejects as well the doctrine of the “ Sacramentarians ” (*i.e.*, Calvinists) about the mere spiritual participation of Christ’s body and blood in the ordinance of the supper, as the Romish dogma of transubstantiation,—while it, on the other hand, defends the consecration of the elements and their “ adoration ” (which, however, we must state in justice to Laurentius, only meant the reception of them in a kneeling posture), the lawfulness of images (not, of course, for purposes of worship), and the general liberty of the church in all merely indifferent matters. The archbishop’s challenge was forthwith met by Beurreus, who sought to refute the attack made upon the “ Sacramentarians ” by a reply in which he justified the Calvinistic doctrine of the Eucharist, appealing, among other things, to the Augsburg Confession and its Apology. This was the first time, so far as is known, that an appeal had been taken to these symbolical writings in Sweden ; but Laurentius, in his answer to Beurreus, which shortly followed, does not seem to attach to them any special weight and importance, although he remarks that between him and the “ Sacramentarian ” doctrine there was no greater agreement than between Christ and Belial ; while, for the rest, he endeavours to find support in Scripture and the fathers for his own view of the Eucharist, and the real presence of the body and blood of Christ in that solemn ordinance. Beurreus shewed no signs of discomfiture, and propounded ten questions referring to the orthodoxy of the Athanasian Creed, the Lord’s

Supper, the union of the divine and human natures in Jesus, &c., &c. But, with the theological culture which since the latter part of the reign of Gustavus was to be found in Sweden, and with the close connection subsisting between that land and Wittenberg and Rostock, where the majority of educated Swedes had studied, it was not likely that the archbishop would long be left alone in his contest with Calvinistic adversaries. Martinus Olai responded to the ten questions of Beurreus, and proposed other interrogations in return. So the warfare progressed, until king Eric found it necessary to calm the disquietude and turbulence thereby awakened, and openly declared himself against Calvinism, which, although not mentioning it by name, he plainly stigmatised as *vrangvis lärdom*, "erroneous doctrine." This was in the edict which he issued from his camp on the 29th August 1563, a few days after he left Stockholm to engage in the newly commenced Danish war. That edict forbade the dissemination of such doctrines among the multitude, and their support by means of controversy; yet at the same time foreigners might retain their individual opinions unmolested. Religious strife continuing to prevail, especially in Stockholm, where the minds of the inhabitants were in a state of chronic controversial agitation, the king finally, in December 1565, promulgated an ordinance in which he says that a number of the strangers who have settled in the country are cherishing and propagating erroneous doctrines, denying that Christ's body and blood are present in the supper, and are really communicated to its recipients, and that the humanity of the Redeemer is equally omnipotent with His divinity. As such doctrines are at variance with Holy Scripture, the king, by virtue of his royal authority, enjoins their professors to abstain from henceforth entertaining them. If they refuse to obey this injunction, then they may retain their false faith at the peril of their souls, as the king "will not reign over any man's conscience." But they are solemnly forbidden, either by word or writing, to disseminate their errors among the king's subjects. Those who were guilty of disobedience should be imprisoned by the royal governors and bailiffs until they promised amendment. If they renewed these transgressions, they should be banished from the country, except within fourteen days they could excuse their conduct before the king. Eric the Fourteenth thus finally decided to permit Calvinism no progress in his dominions, although he retained his promise of religious freedom to the extent,—limited enough at the best,—of its bestowment upon immigrating foreigners in 1561.

This doctrinal conflict led the Swedish Church to a more clearly conscious and complete appropriation of the Lutheran

Confession of Faith. It was compelled to test the Lutheran Confession, not, as before, only in comparison with the Romish, but also with the Calvinistic, and it had now expressly embraced,—so far as the opinions of the king and the theological writers could be held to represent the church's sentiments,—“the doctrine and ritual which harmonised with the teaching of Martin Luther.” Until the present date the Swedish Church had been Protestant in opposition to the Roman Catholic; but henceforth it was Evangelical-Lutheran in opposition to the Reformed. Full thirty years, however, of heavy strife and trials were to elapse ere the labour of ecclesiastical organisation attained its full accomplishment.

To revert to our narrative: when Eric, on the eighth anniversary of his illustrious father's death, was compelled to abdicate the throne, John III. ascended it as his successor. Equally with his brothers he had received an education worthy of the royal rank which they inherited. Yet his mind had, by nature, a greater tendency than theirs to quiet contemplation; and even at the age of twenty he had to submit to paternal warnings against the undue indulgence of solitary reveries. All eyes were at present fixed upon the church, and its circumstances were peculiarly calculated to attract the new monarch's serious attention to those religious differences which divided the world, and to the means for healing the division. The question, whether it were really inevitable that the church's external unity should be dissolved, was one which pressed hard upon the hearts of many, at the moment in which this unity seemed to have irretrievably departed. In England, John had seen the yet fresh traces of Rome's bloody despotism under Mary, and the first attempts at ecclesiastical reconciliation under her successor Elizabeth; and in Sweden, shortly afterwards, he had witnessed the tumult aroused by the Lutheran and Calvinistic warfare. The four years' imprisonment to which he was condemned by his capricious brother, he shared with his wife, who, as belonging to the Romish Church (she was the daughter of Sigismund II., King of Poland), brought an odious creed and form of worship to her adopted country; and thus, in a nature such as John's, there could not fail to arise comparisons that tended to something like religious eclecticism, and terminated in a struggle, lasting for nearly two decades, within the Swedish Church, the result of the king's obstinate efforts to give it a new shape and a new character. It should be remembered, that during the whole of this period, the Church of Rome had scarcely been tolerated in Sweden. Eric the Fourteenth was certainly not its friend. When he was seeking in marriage the hand of Queen Mary of Scotland, he did not forget that she

was a member of the popish communion. He doubted not, as he himself expresses it, that his intended spouse would, along with him, acknowledge the true faith ; but he at the same time instructed his ambassador to inquire what Mary thought of the ecclesiastical changes in his dominions, as also to obtain information about the state of the Scottish Church. The envoy replied that Queen Mary was a papist, and that it was believed she would not abandon her religion. Eric, indeed, was advised to give up the thought of this matrimonial connection, on the express ground that Mary's French relations, the Guises, would alone consent to it in the hope that, by its means, Sweden might again be brought back to "popish idolatry." In the same year, John, then Duke of Finland, espoused the above-named Polish princess. Before his marriage, he promised never to compel his wife to change her catholic creed ; and, at the nuptials, reserved to himself the participation of the eucharist, not according to the popish custom, but according to the practice which was in harmony with the Augsburg Confession,—to use his own words, "*Penes consuetudinem confessionis Augustanæ.*"

Externally, the Swedish Church retained, at the commencement of John's reign, the same constitution which it had possessed throughout the preceding period. The strenuous endeavours of Gustavus to remould it in presbyterian or semi-presbyterian fashion, had been only partially successful, and its organisation and general character were still of the episcopalian type. Much uncertainty, however, continued to prevail with regard to many ecclesiastical matters ; and, for the sake of all parties, it was desirable that the church's constitution should be at last definitely fixed, and formally and legally sanctioned. Archbishop Laurentius Petri, now an old man, longed to see this object accomplished before his departure,—an object which had been the dream and desire of his whole life ; and, when John assumed the sceptre, he earnestly urged him forward to the completion of the good work. Laurentius had already compiled an ecclesiastical code which had been circulated in manuscript, and was held valid before it had been ratified by the authorities in church and state. But while any departures from this code awakened dissatisfaction, as conflicting with sound doctrine, decent order, and desirable unity, they had a fair excuse in the popular ignorance of the rules and regulations it contained, so long as they merely existed in manuscript form. King John, therefore, urged on by the archbishop, gave orders, that after his written constitution had been carefully revised by the prelates and other ecclesiastical superiors, it should be printed and published, and decreed formally binding ever afterwards. Our space will not permit us to give a sum-

mary of this important document; but we may indicate two or three of the chief points which it comprised. Its author refers in the preface to his protracted advocacy of the church's right, independent of extraneous influence, to organise herself as might seem best to her; and, while following out such a principle in the present governmental code, he says that he cannot expect that with *it* all persons should be completely satisfied,—“for where is there any one so fortunate as to please everybody alike?” Consequently, he foresees that the popishly inclined will find it too little catholic, and the “sacramentarians” too Romish, in its tendencies, yet he himself will rest quite content with knowing that it is based upon “sound reason and the word of God.” That sacred word in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments is therefore laid down by him as the foundation-stone on which the entire subsequent superstructure must be erected. For the government of the church, bishops (called also superintendents, *ordinarii* and *ordinatores*) are set apart, whose office, however (and the reader will do well to mark this admission), is not of *immediate divine appointment*, but established for the sake of order, and inasmuch as the said office is not merely most useful, and in accordance with the will of God, the Holy Spirit, the Giver of every good and perfect gift, but has also been approved and adopted throughout the whole of Christendom, and must continue until the end of the world, although any abuses connected therewith are to be sedulously removed. The bishop's duty is to watch over the doctrine and lives of the clergy, over the morals and education of the people, over schools, academies, and hospitals. Yearly with one or two clerks he shall visit in his diocese, and when he himself is prevented from doing so, the dean shall be his substitute. The seven cathedral churches of the realm shall be maintained, with their proper staff of ecclesiastical officials. As regards the inferior clergy, the privilege which each congregation possessed of calling its own pastors is confirmed; but if they are unable to propose any individual for the vacant charge, or if he who has been called shall prove unsuitable, then the bishop shall have the power of naming another person. The rules of church discipline are likewise fully enumerated; but to these we cannot now more particularly allude. Enough has been stated, we think, to shew that the system thus by law established in Sweden was a moderate episcopacy, founded upon the principle of avoiding as much as possible any violent severance from the ancient forms, and, in fact, of conserving them so far as they were in accordance, or *fancied* accordance, with the word of God. By a synod, held at Upsala in 1572, the archbishop's constitution was adopted and confirmed, and the Protestant Church of Sweden seemed at last to be fully organised.

"This congress," remarks the second of our two ecclesiastical historians, "was the chief glory in the life of Laurentius Petri, the seal imprinted on his forty years' long and arduous labours. The venerable father stood here, surrounded by a younger generation, who looked up to him with confidence, and listened reverentially to the words he uttered. It was in the hope that the work was finally accomplished, that he exclaimed, 'Lord, now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace!' In this hope lay for him the reward that God sometimes gives the faithful labourer, to behold the splendour of the triumph, but not the bitterness of the struggle by which it must be gained. Or had he even then a sense of shadowy foreboding, that ere a few years were passed, the edifice he had reared would again be threatened with destruction, and that the very men at present assembled in harmony around him, would be parted from each other in fierce religious conflict, that many of them would wage their warfare amid painful questionings of the truth, and that deposition from office, imprisonment, and exile, would be the lot of no small number who now believed that with united hands they had completed the temple of religious concord?" Shortly after this time of crowning happiness, or dim presentiment, which,—call it by what name we choose,—was the most important epoch in the life of Laurentius Petri, he was summoned to his eternal recompence. "Lord, give peace in our day," were his last words in his last pastoral epistle to his diocese, written in the spring of 1573, to exhort to thankfulness for the recent Swedish victories in Livonia; but the prayer was answered in another sense than that in which he poured it forth. When he felt the end approaching, he requested Erasmus Nicolai, King John's court preacher, to bear his last grateful remembrance to the sovereign, and to conjure him by the imperishable crown which he hoped to win in a higher world, to protect the church in its purity, and preserve for it the fixed position it had now assumed. His death occurred on the 26th October 1573, when he had attained the age of seventy-four, and in the forty-third year of his primacy as archbishop. He was buried by the clergy of his diocese, who mourned for him as for a father, in the choir of Upsala Cathedral, where his gravestone remains until the present time.

The solemn dying adjuration which Laurentius Petri addressed to King John, seems soon to have faded from the monarch's memory. That sovereign, indeed, ever since he ascended the throne, had been planning a scheme of religious compromise, which should reconcile the differences between Protestants and Roman Catholics, and restore, in outward form at all events, the lost unity of Christendom. We have

already alluded to John's peculiar temperament, and the eclectic tendency he evinced from a very early period. It is probable that in his youth he too had received instruction from Beurreus, and that thus the germ of Calvinism may have been early deposited in his mind,—seed sown, however, in an ungrateful soil. Certain it is that his spirit was by nature inclined to piety, or rather pietism. A suggestive anecdote is told of his childish years at Gripsholm Castle. He was then residing there with his parents; and on one occasion, exclaiming that he saw the figure of the crucified Saviour enter the apartment and draw near to where he stood, he fled terrified to the shelter of his mother's arms. This incident occurred at the early age of four. A Vadstena monk had predicted in his boyhood that, although a younger son, he would one day wear the diadem; and the accomplishment of the prediction contributed to gain for the cloister his especial favour. When, at a later period, his perusal of some of Calvin's productions inclined him to the great Genevan Reformer's views, a Lutheran friend recommended him to read as an antidote the works of Cyrill of Alexandria; and this advice drew his attention to the writings of the fathers, and awakened for them his reverence and love. The antidote was effectual; he soon gave up Calvinistic leanings; and, during his long imprisonment, where he had time and opportunity to hold converse with his books, he continued his studies in patristic literature. About that literature he often communed with the chaplains of his Romish wife, men who had not been educated under the Jesuits, or in the principles of the Tridentine Council, and who, therefore, readily coincided with John's own opinion that the source of truth was to be found, *not*, according to usual representation, in the church as gradually developed, through episcopacy and papacy, under the immediate guidance of the Holy Spirit, but in the sacred Scriptures, and the writings of the fathers, which exhibit its doctrines, and bear witness to the faith and worship of the earlier Christian ages. Hence the Jesuit Possevin, trained in the new school's severer spirit, does not scruple to affirm that if these chaplains, as ought to have been the case with them, had been better grounded in dogmatic theology and ecclesiastical polemics, most likely they would have long ago restored Duke John to the communion of the Catholic Church. Thus it is evident that the convictions which John III. entertained regarding Christian faith and the Christian Church, from the hour when he first began openly to intermeddle with ecclesiastical affairs until the period of his death, had already been formed within the walls of his prison-house. But they were convictions which for long he cherished in a kind of dark and doubtful way, until, by two extraneous impulses, strength,

clearness, and solidity were at once imparted to them. The first impulse came from the "Consultatio" of the well-known George Cassander, in which that mediating divine describes to the Emperor Maximilian the Second, the best plan of reconciling the two opposite parties, and putting an end, by a system of mutual concession, to the present divisions in the church. Cassander's "Consultatio" produced a great effect upon the mind of John. The second impulse came from his familiar intercourse with his secretary, Peter Michael Fecht, a disciple of Melancthon and the Wittenberg school, who, in all probability, made John, now reigning monarch, acquainted with Cassander's work. One day the king asked Fecht what he thought of the ancient fathers, as compared with the theological authors of modern times. Fecht replied that he took the greater pleasure in the perusal of patristic writings. From this moment a close covenant was made between the two; and they undertook to investigate together the earliest doctrine, constitution and usages of the Christian Church,—studies which lighted up the flame of a twenty years' warfare among John's Swedish subjects. Yet there can be little doubt that the king would have felt himself less called upon to assume his future independent position between the protestant right of private judgment, and the popish doctrine of blind obedience, if the demands of the latter had not been so importunately addressed to him through his Roman Catholic spouse, Queen Catherine. By *her* instrumentality the see of Rome expected to win back to the true faith the erring sovereign of Sweden, and his people; and all means were therefore put in practice to achieve this desirable result.

Foremost among the men who laboured for the complete restoration of the Romish Church in Poland, the native country or the Swedish queen, was Stanislaus Hosius, bishop of Kulm and Ermeland, and, in 1561, elevated to the rank of cardinal. A pattern of Jesuitic piety, and loudly praised by his Catholic contemporaries for his learning and devotion, he early consecrated his gifts to the one object of his life,—the extirpation of protestantism and the resuscitation of the lost papal power. By word and deed he wrought unweariedly for the furtherance of the end he had in view. The mildness of King Sigismund Augustus he strove to harden into implacable resentment against heretics and heresies,—his favourite maxim being that the protestants were to be defeated, not with the pen, but with the sword, "*non stylo, sed sceptro magistratum, coercendos esse.*" In 1571, he hoped, on account of theological dissensions in the Lutheran Church, to regain for Rome the Elector of Saxony and his subjects, for which purpose he resolved to send

thither some Jesuit emissaries, and exhorted Duke Albert of Bavaria to aid him in the enterprise, a request, however, which that prince declined. When, after the death of Sigismund, in 1572, the estates of Poland decreed religious freedom for the Protestants,—the so-called *pax dissidentium*,—he laboured with all his might to prevent Henry of Anjou, the newly-chosen sovereign, from ratifying the ordinance; and, after Henry notwithstanding had confirmed it, he sought to prevail with him to break his oath, inasmuch as it should not be considered binding,—a notable feature by which to judge of the moral worth of Hosius, and the real nature of his ecclesiastical activity. Lutherans, in his estimation, could not be accounted Christians; their doctrine he styled “Satanism,” and their preachers were “atheists,” worse than parricides and robbers. It was this violent champion of the papacy who, in the first instance, endeavoured, through the Queen of Sweden, to effect a Romanising metamorphosis in her husband’s as yet uncertain mind. Hosius was now resident at Rome, and from thence, on the ground of his friendship with the princes of the Jagellon dynasty, he despatched to Queen Catherine letter after letter, filled with exhortations to steadfastness in the faith, and entreating her assistance in the great work of John’s conversion. In 1573, he wrote to the Swedish king himself. But, to do John justice, the reply he sent was not what Hosius expected. The truth is that the former seems, by this time, to have fully determined to take up an independent religious position of his own, and, however much he might dislike what he deemed the extravagances of Lutheranism, to avoid doing aught that savoured of a willingness to resume once more Rome’s heavy spiritual yoke.

It was in such circumstances that the Synod of Stockholm assembled, on the 6th June 1574. More than seven months had elapsed since the death of Archbishop Laurentius Petri, and no one had as yet been appointed to the see left vacant by his decease. The intervening time was devoted by King John, and his friend and secretary, Fecht, to the studies which were designed to give form and substantiality to their future ecclesiastical projects. When the Synod met, the king himself appeared at it, and not obscurely indicated the peculiar views he entertained. He seems to have found it already necessary to dispel the suspicions floating in men’s minds that he was about to return to the Romish communion; all this, he said, was an utter falsehood. For his own part, he would preserve, protect, and perpetuate the “doctrine of the *ancient church*,” and provide for the liberal support of religion and of learning. But it was well known how many heresies were now being disseminated through the different countries of Europe, and how

much division and disturbance existed even among the theologians who adhered to the Augsburg Confession, certain of whom in Wittenberg and Leipzig would somewhat fashion their doctrine in accordance with the belief of the early Christian fathers, while others presumptuously assailed it. In the midst of such discussion concerning matters of faith, it might be therefore advisable to attach oneself to the "apostolic and catholic belief of the earliest church,"—a belief corroborated alike by the sacred Scriptures and the writings of the holy fathers. In many respects we had departed from it; the order of the mass* in especial had deviated from the ancient liturgies, and should be forthwith restored to its pristine purity. Then, cautiously feeling his way, the king propounded certain minor changes in the celebration of the eucharist, which, however, with the exception of one or two, the Synod declined to entertain. Thereafter, mainly through John's influence, Laurentius Petri (usually called the younger, to distinguish him from his father-in-law and predecessor in the primacy), at that time professor in Upsala, was elected to the vacant see. In learning, the new archbishop surpassed most of his contemporaneous fellow-countrymen; but yet it could scarcely be affirmed of him, to use the common expression, that he was "the right man in the right place." The period was one of spiritual storm and convulsion; grievous trials were impending over the newly-formed Protestant Church of Sweden; and Laurentius Petri the younger, lacked the unyielding strength of spirit which was requisite to grapple with external opponents, and to check effectually internal broils. Of a flexible and wavering nature, he was too much inclined to give way to the plans which, with characteristic stubbornness, the king for a series of years attempted to obtrude upon himself, the other bishops, and the inferior clergy,—so that where an ecclesiastical helmsman, gifted with greater nerve and energy, would have steered the church's vessel safe through the tempestuous surges, under the guidance of the new metropolitan it was too frequently in danger of being well nigh left to the tender mercies of the stormy winds and waves.

We can but very briefly advert to the incidents which more immediately followed. In the February of 1575, King John issued a set of "ordinances," as they were called, which he had compiled with Fecht's assistance, and submitted for their approbation to some of the deans and bishops, along with the

* It is almost superfluous to remark that the word *massa* or "mass," must here, as in the Lutheran Churches generally, be taken in its widest sense, i.e., the service at the dispensation of the Lord's Supper, and not necessarily the popish ritual which distinctively bears that name.

clergy of the capital. The required approbation, it is rather singular to find, was granted, although after serious consideration and much reluctance, by the ecclesiastical authorities thus assembled. For the "ordinances" were, to all intents and purposes, an alarming backward step in the career of the Swedish Reformation. In them were fully embodied the middle views which had been so zealously embraced by the sovereign, and which, neither popish nor Lutheran, hovered in a kind of spiritual cloudland between the two,—professing to oppose Rome on the one hand, yet the whole time, insensibly it may be, still surely nearing her,—and on the other hand, professing to oppose Calvinism, yet along with it virtually condemning what even the evangelical Lutherans believed to be harmonious with Scripture. Unfortunately, our space will not permit us to enumerate the various articles in the "ordinances"; but this is a matter of the less moment, as the chief interest gathers around the subsequent "liturgical" struggle, which was properly the legitimate and inevitable issue of the "ordinances" that preceded it. Notwithstanding, we must again record our surprise, that the very men who afterwards imperilled their offices for their resistance to the liturgy and the ordinances themselves, should now, at the request of the king, have sanctioned, however unwillingly, the latter. The only charitable motive we can assign for such conduct is that, from sad lack of forethought, they saw in these ordinances a mere code of minor regulations, which did not bear within them the germ of greater and more disastrous changes yet to come.

It was not long until the bishops and the Stockholm clergy found good cause to repent their too ready and blameable compliance with the wishes of the sovereign. For some time he had been engaged, by Fecht's aid, in the compilation of a new Liturgy for the Swedish Church, intended to replace the one presently in use, which had been prepared by Olaus Petri in 1531. Olof's liturgy or "missal" was unmistakeably Protestant in its whole scope and character, and therefore distasteful to King John, who, as one most important step towards the accomplishment of his dearly cherished object, desired to effect a change in the eucharistic service, for the purpose of closely approximating that service to the ritual of the Church of Rome. The new liturgy, in truth,—first published in the spring of 1576, and called familiarly the Red Book, from the colour of its binding,—was based upon the "Missale Romanum," or Roman Missal, employed in the papal worship, and involving, of course, the doctrine of transubstantiation. The passage chiefly offensive in the Red Book was the following:—"Thy same Son, the same sacrifice, which is a pure, unspotted, and holy sacrifice, exhibited for our reconciliation, for our shield, shelter, and

protection against Thy wrath, and against the terrors of sin and death, we do with faith receive, and with our humble prayers offer (*frambära*, i.e., 'set forth,' or 'offer') before Thy glorious majesty."* But, independently of this passage, the whole of the new missal was pervaded by a Romanising spirit,—in so far, at least, as it deviated from the previous missal of Olaus Petri,—because of course it could not be said that the former lacked *all* points of resemblance to the latter, which had now been used for upwards of forty years in Sweden. The dissemination of the Red Book was at first accompanied by no order for its adoption. Its authors expected that this would gradually follow through the agency of the bishops in their several dioceses, and only sought meanwhile to make it generally known, before its introduction, by formal and solemn decree, for congregational use in general. It was by separate and semi-private negotiations that, at the beginning, King John expected to gain his end. But the issue of such attempts would have intimidated any one less self-willed and less firmly convinced of the truth and justice of his cause than was the opinionative Swedish sovereign. The earliest sign of the approaching tempest appeared in the capital, where the clergy soon evinced their complete repugnance to the proposed ecclesiastical innovation. Although, as has been already mentioned, they had subscribed the "ordinances" of the preceding year, they had notwithstanding refused to put them in practice, so soon as the speedily ensuing sequel, i.e., the liturgy, denoted with sufficient clearness the goal at which the king and Fecht were aiming. They declined to celebrate, in the June of 1576, the then occurring solemnity of the "Body of Christ," which had been for the first time enjoined upon them by the "ordinances," and which, from its close connection with the popish doctrine of transubstantiation, might well give rise to doubts and suspicions of the gravest kind. When, during the following autumn, the Nativity of the Virgin Mary fell, by the same "ordinances," to be celebrated on the 8th September, they again refused to yield obedience, and expressly declared their firm resolve to reject the Red Book, the introduction of which into divine service at Stockholm was to have taken place that very day. Foremost among the malcontents were two, respectively named Olof and Abraham, who, however, did not lack zealous adherents and supporters. Their undisguised opposition was more than John could tolerate, especially as it might prove a dangerous example on account of the prominent

* The exact words of the Romish Missal are "*offerimus præclaræ magistatî tuæ, de donis tuis et datis, hostiam sanctam, hostiam immaculatam, panem sanctum vitæ æternæ et calicem salutis perpetuæ.*" The words "*offerimus*" and "*hostiam*" are retained in the Latin text of King John's liturgy.

place occupied by those who thus stepped forth as hostile to his royal wishes. Olof and Abraham, therefore, along with two others, the chaplains Ericus Petri and Petrus Erixi, were, on the 7th September, suspended from their offices, and detained prisoners in their several dwellings. The king charged them not merely with disobedience to ecclesiastical law, but with violating the allegiance they owed to their earthly sovereign. From a second quarter, moreover, the mutterings of the impending storm were heard. This quarter was the dukedom of John's youngest brother Charles. In impressible boyhood, before he reached the early age of ten, Charles had stood beside his father's knees, when the great Gustavus, shortly prior to his death, took his last solemn farewell of his people's deputies, and uttered the words of paternal love and fervour which no Swedish heart can yet remember without emotion. Inheriting, beyond the other sons, his father's power and earnestness, he perhaps cherished also, as not seldom happens to children who are early rendered orphans, with profounder and holier reverence that illustrious father's memory. Often in his boyhood he was seen perusing the testamentary instructions of Gustavus, which, in addition to temporal bequests, contained the memorable exhortation addressed to his son, "never to allow himself to be drawn from God's pure doctrine, but therein continually to abide." King Eric had with great care watched over the education of his younger brother; and the religious discussions so common at the time, and especially in the Swedish Court, concerning Lutheranism, Calvinism, and Popery, must have been familiar to Charles from a very early period, and, as is proved by the events that followed, must have produced a deep effect upon his mind. When eighteen years old, he took possession of the principality allotted him, which comprised the whole diocese of Strengnäs, and a portion of that of Skara, including the districts of Vadsbo and Valla in Västergötland. His father's will had provided no definite arrangements with regard to matters ecclesiastical in the province which formed Charles's dukedom; but Eric, in 1561, had entered into an agreement with his brother, which stipulated that the latter should enjoy the privilege of appointing the inferior clergy, although not the bishops or "ordinaries,"—a right reserved for the reigning sovereign. The parish priests of the principality were to share in the management of all church affairs along with their brethren in the remainder of the kingdom. Such was the ecclesiastical condition of the separate dominions of Duke Charles, when, in 1576, the famous Red Book or liturgy appeared. As early as the month of March it was transmitted to Charles through Göran Gera, Eric Sparre, and Henrick Mattson, whom King John had sent to Nyköping

for that purpose, and who were also empowered to convey the request that Charles would introduce the new prayer-book into divine service within his territories as speedily as possible. Duke Charles replied half evasively and half in language of reproof. "With regard to the new ecclesiastical forms," he said, "he could not so easily approve of them and put them in public practice, while he bore in mind that he, like his other brothers, was so solemnly advised and enjoined, by their father's dying testament, to guard against human doctrines and inventions." Continued negotiations during the summer and the autumn had no influence in prevailing upon Charles to return a more favourable reply. He and the clergy of his principality had now assumed the firm position from which they never afterwards could be either enticed or compelled to withdraw. Jealous of his privileges, the duke compiled a collection of extracts from the records on which he based his right to temporal and spiritual jurisdiction within the territories over which he ruled. Finally, in September 1576, he assembled the representatives of his subjects at Nyköping, where they bound themselves stedfastly to maintain the true faith and doctrine, and not to embrace any other religious rites than those which had been in Christian use from the time of Gustavus until the present day. There is no doubt that the resolution thus adopted, and scrupulously observed to the last, formed one chief obstacle to John's bold, but at once unwise and unscriptural ecclesiastical innovations.

In the midst of the gathering storm of opposition, both in his brother's dukedom and the kingdom proper, the Swedish monarch convoked the estates of the realm and a subsequent synod, to be held in the month of February 1577. On the 11th day of that month the diet was opened by King John. In his introductory address he drew a dark, and, we shall charitably hope, somewhat exaggerated picture of the existing condition of the clergy in his dominions. He complained that neither in life nor in acquirements were they fitted for their sacred calling. They allowed the churches to fall into disrepair; and, especially, they solemnised the sacrament of the supper in unworthy fashion, with unwashed hands, in dirt-stained clothes, often wearing riding-boots and spurs; not unfrequently the sacred elements were dispensed by them from wooden platters, and vessels of tin or clay, while at the entertainments which they gave in their own houses, they made use of cups of silver. Each one introduced new rites and ceremonies according to his individual will and pleasure. He (John) had therefore of his own accord, as well as moved thereto by many supplications from his subjects, compiled, with the assistance of the primate and the bishop of Vesterås,

a series of rules for divine service and for the proper celebration of the eucharist, in order that the clergy might lead their hearers to the true fear of God. They were not, he continued, to believe the false reports in circulation, that he was going to smuggle in heresy and unsound doctrine, to re-establish a Latin service and the celibacy of the priesthood, or that he had already invited monks by the thousand to take up their residence in Sweden. He concluded by asking the Estates if they were willing to adopt the liturgy he had thus prepared,—a question to which those who did reply, replied in the affirmative. It would seem as if the clergy had not been present on this occasion; but, whether or no, the king evidently proceeded upon the assumption that they had not given their assent along with the other members of the diet. For, the next day, the Synod,—if it can indeed be called so,—was opened, under the presidency of John himself. A vote was immediately taken; they who approved of the liturgy were to occupy the right, they who disapproved of it, the left. On the right side the majority assembled around the archbishop; on the left, a smaller number gathered round Bishop Martin Gestricius of Linköping, who now assumed the vacant place as opposition leader. An earnest attempt was made by the king to gain over, by argument and entreaty, the minority to his views. The question was discussed aloud in his presence between the primate and Bishop Martin. The respect which the latter had acquired for learning and integrity, lent the greatest importance to his opinions; and his unfavourable criticism of the new liturgy produced a deep impression on his auditors. Yet, notwithstanding, when the Synod reassembled, the day following, at Stockholm Castle, Bishop Martin *stood alone*; all those who, a few hours before, seemed to share his convictions, had now fairly deserted him for the other side. It is certainly somewhat difficult to comprehend a result so singular. But, in the first place, it must be remembered that the meeting was not properly a Synod; it did not fairly represent the Swedish clergy,—for the adoption of the liturgy was only sanctioned by ninety-six persons, exclusive of the bishops who were favourable to it; and in the second place, there is much force in the judgment passed by Anjou on the whole proceedings of this so-called Council of the Church. “It requires,” he remarks, “no great measure of attention to the phraseology of its final resolution, to discover that here we have not men who, with free and full conviction, pledge themselves to what they confirm by the subscription of their names; and with such expressions of approval no one would rest satisfied, whose views were *cordially* accepted. It was just a sample of the attempts at accommodation, repeated over and over again in history, when

parties who are really unreconciled to each other meet upon a half-way territory which purblind mediators call that of peace and reconciliation, but which, for one or both of them, is rather that of falsehood and hypocrisy,—meet for a single hour, to be severed the next, with increased bitterness of feeling, so much the farther from each other.” On the 27th February the bishops left Stockholm, in order, as their several feelings prompted them, either to advance or impede the introduction of the liturgy into their different dioceses. Archbishop Laurentius Petri was especially zealous in forwarding the wishes of his sovereign. He would tolerate no disobedience to the mandate compelling the employment of the new prayer-book, and declared that whoever of the clergy should refuse to receive it before the following 18th of May, would thereby forfeit his office—a declaration reduced to practice in the case of some, who remained firm in their opposition to the hated manual. In the diocese of Skara a similar intolerant course was pursued. Within the bishoprics of Linköping and Strengnäs, however, the enforcement of the liturgy had to encounter much greater difficulties, arising partly with the occupiers of the two sees themselves. Bishop Martin of Linköping, after his return from Stockholm, did nothing to further the adoption of the prayer-book, but, on the other hand, emitted, along with his chapter, a declaration, in which they stated that it was unadvisable either by command or compulsion to introduce its use. Bishop Nils of Strengnäs, while the Stockholm Synod was still in progress, despatched messengers to ascertain from his sovereign prince, Duke Charles, the opinion of the latter with regard to the new liturgy. Charles replied that “he did not know of any other church ritual or missal than that which had been so long employed in Sweden, and had no desire to try anything novel,—however fair-seeming the reasons might be for its adoption,—until it was clearly proved to him that the old ritual was wrong, and that the grounds of its employment were untenable.” Within Charles’s dukedom no subsequent step was taken which denoted the slightest approval of the new ecclesiastical change. Its ruler was as stubborn in his determination as was King John himself; and when, in the August of 1577, he set out on a foreign journey, he strictly enjoined his unmarried sister Elizabeth to continue firm in the doctrine which had been adopted during their father’s lifetime. While absent on this journey, he more than once exhorted the bishop to refuse his sanction to any change in divine service while he was away from his dominions. He publicly assumed the position which he occupied ever afterwards, as the great supporter of the opponents of the liturgy, and began to open a place of refuge in his territories for the Swedish clergy who

were deposed from their charges on account of their refusal to receive it. But all this had no weight with John, who, prompted by his wife, and strengthened by the proselytising efforts now strongly put forth by Rome, urged forward his favourite scheme with an indomitable energy worthy of a better cause. He had at last openly called the Jesuits to his kingdom, and all the former rumours of his conversion to the Catholic faith were alarmingly revived and circulated. The Vatican, in truth, cherished strong hopes of the final realisation of its wishes, and beheld in prospect the Swedish sovereign and his people once more prostrate at the feet of the supreme pontiff, and devoted children of the Romish Church. A time of heavy trial came for those who remained faithful among the Lutheran clergy of Sweden; and high honour is due to the firm and constant sufferers who, at the risk of losing their every temporal possession, refused to bow down before the man-made semi-popish Dagon which John, in his obstinate infatuation, had constructed and commanded them, under the severest penalties, to worship. To the fact that so many *were* faithful is mainly owing, under the providence of God, the rescue of the Swedish Church from re-immersion in the ancient spiritual darkness,—a darkness that would have been all the drearier after the brief preceding years of comparative gospel radiance.

Meanwhile, we cannot more appropriately conclude than by quoting the weighty and suggestive words of Bishop Anjou, in which, referring to the whole of the great liturgical conflict, he remarks as follows:—"The severity with which King John endeavoured to compel the introduction of his prayer book, was the testing-fire which purified the Swedish Church to a clear conviction of the Protestant principles which formed its basis. Besides what we have already mentioned, many cases are recorded of the ecclesiastical confusion which it caused, and of the sore soul-trouble occasioned to each Swedish pastor by the question forced upon him, whether his conscience approved or rejected this novel liturgy; and the names of many are given, who partly on their death-beds lamented in the deepest penitence that they had been seduced to sanction the fatal prayer book, partly ended their sorrowing lives in madness,—narratives of which incidents were sometimes carefully drawn up and attested by the members of the congregations so sadly tried. Of the *people's* inclination to the liturgy no evidence remains, except the petitions referred to by King John in 1577, and what Possevin says on the same subject; no dissatisfaction, such as appeared in the time of King Gustavus, when the superfluous ecclesiastical ceremonies were removed, was now expressed towards the clergy who declined

to reintroduce them. But, on the other hand, it is recorded that many persons absented themselves from public worship in the churches where it was conducted according to the new form, and attended those only where it was not employed; and that many also, at the point of death, refused to receive the sacrament when it could solely be administered to them by the hands of a liturgic minister; while not a few parents recalled their sons from their schools and studies, to withdraw them from the storms of an uncertain future." So unpalatable were King John's Romanising innovations to the majority of his Swedish subjects.

J. J.

ART. II.—*Scoto-Calvinism and Anglo-Puritanism.*
An Irenicum.

THOSE of our readers who have dipped, even sparingly, into the history of Christian doctrine, must have remarked how often churches and sects which agree with each other on the main points of religion, assume, in course of time, shades of diversity which distinguish them from each other, as decidedly as the different species of animals which belong to the same genus in natural history. If they happen to have burst asunder in deadly strife, the two parties retain for ages after the colour of the dogma for which they respectively contended. But even when the parting has been friendly, like that of Abraham and Lot, each taking its own way, mutual distance will often produce all the effects of alienation. Time, which works its changes on societies as well as on the human frame, seldom fails to leave the marks of its finger on the two churches; and if they should chance to meet each other in conference with a view to reunion, they may be hardly able to recognise each other as members of the same family, so many are the small points on which they are found to disagree. To trace the minute shades that distinguish churches known as evangelical, is a delicate task, demanding an amount of impartiality which it may be deemed presumption, perhaps, for us to claim. We can only say that in attempting this task, we feel conscious of no other motive than that of a sincere desire to effect a hearty reconciliation between parties who, we are persuaded, substantially agree in the grand vital doctrines of the cross. We confine ourselves at present to two of these parties who may be said to have existed in Scotland for nearly a century and a half, and whom, for the sake of distinction, we have named the Scoto-Calvinistic and the Anglo-Puritan. To

explain the differences to which those terms refer, it may be necessary to take a brief historical retrospect.

Our first reformers expressed themselves on the leading doctrines of the gospel with singular boldness and freedom. While zealously contending for the doctrine of predestination, they were not the less strenuous in preaching the free gospel of the grace of God. Obviously they were quite unconscious of any antagonism between these two things. Both of them they found taught with equal plainness in the Word of God. Both of them they found fraught with edification and comfort to the believer ; and both of them, without attempting a metaphysical adjustment between them, they urged on the unquestioning reception of all true Christians. Calvin and Knox, so well known as advocates of the divine decrees, frequently employ language, when speaking of the love of God and the duty of man, which would be accepted by many in the present day, who are partial to the views of Arminius.

“ Therefore (says Calvin) has Christ brought in life because our heavenly Father was unwilling that the human race (*genus humanum*) which he loved should perish.”

“ Nothing else can be seen in Christ than this, that from his infinite goodness, God was willing to help us, that he might save the perishing ; and as often as our sins oppress us, as often as Satan would drive us to despair, let us hold up this shield, God is not willing that we should be consigned to eternal destruction, because he has ordained his Son to be the salvation of the world.”—(Calvin on John iii. 16.)

“ The common solution of this passage (He is the propitiation not for our sins only, but also for the sins of the whole world), given by the schoolmen, is, that Christ suffered sufficiently for the whole world, but efficaciously only for the elect, *pro toto mundo passum esse Christum, sed pro electis tantum efficaciter*. I grant that this is true, but it does not apply to the words of the apostle, whose meaning simply is, that the death of Christ was the common benefit of the whole church ; it embraces not the reprobate, but all who should afterwards believe ; for then is the grace of Christ duly set forth when he is preached as the only salvation of the world.”—(Calvin on 1st John ii. 2.)

The following, taken from a beautiful prayer in what has been called Knox's liturgy, runs in the same strain :—

“ O Father of mercy and God of all consolation, seeing all creatures do acknowledge and confess thee as Governôr and Lord, it becometh us, the workmanship of thine own hand, at all times to reverence and magnify thy godly majesty ; first, for that thou hast created us in thine own image and similitude, but chiefly because thou hast delivered us from that everlasting death and damnation, into the which Satan drew mankind by the means of sin, from the bondage whereof neither man nor angel was able to make us free ; but thou, O Lord, rich in mercy, and infinite in goodness, has provided our redemption to stand in

thine only and well-beloved Son, whom of very love thou didst give to be made man like unto to us in all things, sin excepted, that in his body he might receive the punishment of our transgression, by his death to make satisfaction to thy justice, and by his resurrection to destroy him that was author of death, and so to bring again life to the world, from which all the whole offspring of Adam most justly was exiled."

Again, in another prayer used in the French church in Geneva, and included in the same book, we read as follows:—

"We make our prayers unto thee, O Lord God most merciful Father, for all men in general, that as thou wilt be known to be the Saviour of all the world by the redemption purchased by thine only Son Jesus Christ, even so that such as have been hitherto holden captive in darkness and ignorance for lack of the knowledge of thy gospel, may through the preaching thereof, and the clear light of thine Holy Spirit, be brought into the right way of salvation."

A change, however, may be observed in the tone of their immediate successors. Under the chilling breath of controversy, the waters of life, which flowed and sparkled so freely in the morning of the Reformation, were congealed into the propositions of a cold and rigid orthodoxy. It is well known that during the 17th century our Scottish ministers studied on the continent, and borrowed most of their theological ideas from the writings of the Dutch and Belgium divines. After the Synod of Dort, they partook largely of the Anti-Arminian spirit; and their theology, owing to this antagonism, became more formal, more guarded, and more one-sided than that of the early reformers. The efforts of Laud to introduce along with Romanism, a species of Pelagianism into the Church of England, tended still more to intensify the opposition of our Scottish divines to every thing that savoured of Arminianism. The Westminster Confession bears sufficient evidence to the prevalence of this spirit; but in the eyes of some of our Scottish theologians, it does not seem to have gone far enough in that direction. To this feeling, perhaps, we owe the "Sum of saving knowledge," said to have been the joint production of Mr James Durham and Mr David Dickson, a document, which, though not recognised as part of our standards, is generally bound up with our Confession of Faith, and was no doubt intended to pronounce the mind of the Church of Scotland upon the Arminian points, more decisively than the Confession had done. This treatise brings out very clearly the contrast between what we have called the Scoto-Calvinistic and the Anglo-Puritan schools of theology. In the first place, it proceeds on the assumption that there are two covenants connected with man's salvation: the covenant of *redemption* between God the

Father and the Son from all eternity, and the covenant of *grace* made between God and the believer in time. This distinction implies that the covenant of grace involves certain conditions which must be fulfilled by the sinner before he can partake of its blessings ; for although it is stated that " God requireth no other conditions but faith," yet under the term " faith," a great deal more is included than the simple act of believing ; as appears from the following explanations :—" If ye will believe me, *and be reconciled to me*, I will, by covenant, give unto you Christ and all saving graces in him." " The way of reconciliation was in all ages one and the same in substance, viz., by forgiving the sins of *them who do acknowledge their sins and their enmity against God, and do seek reconciliation and remission of sins in Christ.*" " IF men shall acknowledge the enmity, and shall be content to enter into covenant of friendship with God through Christ, THEN God will be content to be reconciled with them freely."

Another peculiarity of this treatise lies in the prominence which is given throughout to the doctrine of election. The whole system of gospel truth is formulated with a special reference to this doctrine. Thus, instead of simply stating, as is done in the Confession, that the end of Christ's death was to satisfy divine justice and to reconcile us unto God, it is said, that " God having freely chosen unto life a certain number of lost mankind, for the glory of his rich grace, did give them, before the world began, unto God the Son, appointed Redeemer, that upon condition he would submit himself to the law as surety *for them*, and satisfy justice *for them* by giving obedience in *their name*, even unto the suffering of the cursed death of the cross, he should ransom and redeem *them* all from sin and death, and purchase *unto them* righteousness and eternal life." No notice is taken of such passages as John iii. 16, " God so loved the world," &c. ; and when commenting on 2 Cor. v. 14, " God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself," care is taken to qualify the expression by uniformly representing it as the "*elect world.*" The outward ordinances of the gospel are represented as appointed "to make the elect partakers of the covenant of grace, and all the rest that are called to be inexcusable"; and while it is granted that in his word the Lord makes offers of grace to all sinners, this is qualified by what follows, "upon condition of faith in Jesus Christ; and whosoever do confess their sin, accept of Christ offered, and submit themselves to his ordinances, he will have both them and their children received into the honour and privileges of the covenant of grace." The offers of grace and salvation in such passages as Isaiah lv. 1, " Ho every one that thirsteth," &c., are described as addressed

not to men universally, but to those only who have been called "sensible sinners," or, as it is expressed in this treatise, "to every soul without exception, that *truly desires to be saved* from sin and wrath."

We need only add, that according to this "sum of saving knowledge," faith does not carry within it the nature of assurance or appropriation ; which can only be reached by a painful and laborious process of self-examination. The mode in which this process is to be conducted is by a series of syllogisms of which the following may serve as a specimen :—

"Thence may the weak believer strengthen his faith, by reasoning after this manner : Whosoever believeth the doctrines delivered by the Son of God, and findeth himself partly drawn powerfully to believe in him, and partly driven by the fear of God's wrath to adhere unto him, may be sure of right and interest to life eternal through him.

"But sinful and unworthy, I (may the weak believer say) do believe the doctrine delivered by the Son of God, and do feel myself partly drawn powerfully to believe in him, by the sight of life in him ; and partly driven by the fear of God's wrath, to adhere unto him : Therefore I may be sure of my right and interest unto eternal life through him.

"Thence he who hath closed a bargain with God, may strengthen his faith by reasoning after this manner : Whosoever doth heartily receive the offer of free grace, made free to sinners, thirsting for righteousness and salvation, unto him, by an everlasting covenant, belongeth Christ, the true David, with all his sure and saving mercies.

"But I (may the weak believer say) do heartily receive the offer of free grace, made here to sinners, thirsting for righteousness and salvation. Therefore unto me, by an everlasting covenant, belongeth Christ Jesus with all his saving mercies."

This method of teaching saving knowledge differs very considerably from that of the Anglo-Puritan school. The two modes may be said to have come into collision in the Marrow controversy of 1720. The book entitled "The Marrow of Modern Divinity," is a compilation of the sentiments of English and foreign divines,* the first part of which is devoted to the illustration of the gospel, as a proclamation of free and unconditional mercy to the race of mankind. The character of the treatise may be understood when we briefly state, that the grand object of the author was to draw a sharp contrast between the law and the gospel, and to prove that the latter was a system of pure grace, flowing from the boundless love of God, unencumbered by any conditions or qualifications ; a

* The book was published in England by Mr Edward Fisher, and having fallen into the hands of the celebrated Thomas Boston, he was so much struck with admiration for it, that he republished it in Scotland with copious notes and comments.

system not of precepts but of promises ; not of penalties, but of privileges, and breathing throughout only peace and good will toward man. The covenant of grace was held to be one and indivisible, the proper and only condition of which was the finished work of the Son of God. This condition having been fulfilled, the blessings of the covenant are offered unto all men without exception or limitation.

Christ was exhibited in the gospel as God's love-gift to a perishing world. He is called "the Saviour of the world," a term which belongs to him in his official character, and to him alone, "God loved the world," taking this term in its large general sense as meaning the world of mankind sinners, irrespective of any distinction between elect and non-elect. The gospel message is, "To you, O men, I call, and my voice is to the sons of men." The invitations to "every one that is thirsty"—"to all that labour and are heavy laden," are held to include all in a state of nature, who are thirsting for happiness and laden with care, and even those who say, "we are rich and have need of nothing," and who know not (are not sensible) that they are "wretched and miserable."

Every child of Adam, therefore, is warranted simply in virtue of his connection with the human race, to consider himself as personally addressed in the offers of grace, and to appropriate to himself Christ and his salvation. This he is encouraged to do by being assured of the fact that Christ, whom he is invited to receive, has satisfied all the claims of justice, has taken away sin, and brought in an everlasting righteousness. Faith is a simple reception of, and resting upon, Christ, as freely offered to us in the gospel. Wherever this faith exists, it will produce fruit in genuine repentance, reconciliation to God, and new obedience. Still, saving faith is not to be regarded in the light of a federal condition, or as a term to be fulfilled in a bargain between God and the sinner, far less as including confession, contrition, desire of reconciliation to God, &c. ; it is but the hand stretched out to receive the boon of eternal life presented to us in Christ. Further, faith, according to the Marrow, partakes essentially of the nature of assurance ; but a clear distinction is drawn between the assurance of *faith* and the assurance of *sense* ; the former of these being identical with the *fiducia* of the reformers, and resting simply on the word of God and the work of Christ ; whereas the latter is the assurance of grace and salvation spoken of in the Confession, as attainable, but not essentially necessary to salvation, flowing from the testimony of the Spirit and Christian experience. It follows that from the motives of Christian obedience we must exclude the servile fear of wrath, and the mercenary hope of reward. Faith

worketh by love, and the obedience of the Christian is that of a grateful and loving child.

Such is a brief summary of the Marrow doctrine. We do not now enter into the merits of the controversy which ensued. Our object is simply to point out the diversity between the two modes of theological treatment. The diversity between them must be apparent to the most cursory observer. The first mentioned is marked by a singular harshness of tone and metaphysical hardness of aspect, from which few evangelical preachers of the present day would not shrink with an instinctive feeling of repugnance. It is not in such terms that the Scriptures speak of the glorious gospel of the grace of God. It is not in such a guise that our first reformers presented the saving knowledge of the Evangel, when its blessed face, stripped of the winding sheet of popery, shone out again on the benighted world at the era of the Reformation. It is not in such formulas that the Christian gives expression to his faith, when breathing forth his soul to God in prayer, or in thanksgiving for the blessings of salvation. Still the sum of saving knowledge exhibits in its main features the theology of what was deemed the orthodox party, for a considerable period, in the Church of Scotland. Shortly after the Revolution, traces of this appeared in the decisions of the General Assembly. In 1720–1722, the Marrow of Modern Divinity was formally condemned, and the ministers of the church were strictly enjoined to warn their people against it; an act which remains uncanceled in the records of the Assembly to the present day. Against this act twelve ministers gave in a solemn representation, among the signatures to which were the names of Thomas Boston, Ebenezer and Ralph Erskine, and other fathers of the Secession. To these good men this act appeared as a surrender of some of the most precious truths of the gospel; and the spirit of defection which it indicated, led more, perhaps, than anything else, to the secession which followed. The succeeding history is too well known to be repeated. The cold and hard orthodoxy of the preceding period gradually merged into neonomianism, pelagianism, and legality. On the other hand, the Secession continued to maintain the evangelical tinge imparted to it at its birth. The doctrines of the Marrow were embodied in their "act concerning the doctrine of grace," under which unpromising title the purely gratuitous character of the gospel, as tidings of mercy to mankind, and the duty of sinners, "such as they are, without one plea," to come to the Lord Jesus by faith, and embrace him for salvation, and the perfect freeness of the justification of the believer, are set forth and vindicated with a precision and force seldom equalled,

and, we venture to say, never since surpassed. During the dark night of moderatism, in the last century, the pulpits of the Secession alone, in many parts of the land, reflected the light of evangelical truth ; and the utmost jealousy was manifested by its church courts to maintain it pure and incorrupt.

The natural tendencies of the two systems which we have now delineated, in moulding religious sentiment and teaching, within and without the pale of the establishment, hardly admit of dispute, and the results must be apparent to all who are familiar with the theological writings of the two schools. Truth compels us to admit that on both sides a tendency became ultimately visible, to push their respective modes to excess. In the National Church, even among those known as evangelical preachers, it must be admitted that there was a want of breadth and freedom in addressing the overtures of salvation unconditionally to mankind, and considerable obscurity was thrown on the path of salvation by an admixture of law and gospel, by restricting the gospel call to "penitent sinners," and by shutting the door of assurance against all those who had not experienced, or could not produce, a certain amount of evidence of their conversion in the fruits of a holy life. To the example and influence of the late Dr Andrew Thomson, Dr Chalmers, and their compeers, may be justly attributed the commencement of a new era in the preaching of the National Church. And yet, whether it may be traced to early training, association, or example, it is certain that in the National Church there lingered, if it does not still continue to linger, an antagonism, more or less decided, to the style of teaching contained in the Marrow.*

In the Secession, again, in the present century, there has been a tendency, on the part of some, to stretch the doctrines of the Marrow beyond their original design, and their legitimate conclusions. We need only advert, in illustration of this, to the rise of what has been called Morrisonianism. And if, even in cautious, metaphysical Scotland, these doctrines have been pushed to such a degree of extravagance, it is not surprising

* It is a curious fact, that the late Dr M'Crie, who furnished to the pages of the "Christian Instructor," in 1832, a series of papers on the History of the Marrow controversy, studiously abstained from expressing an opinion on the merits of the controversy ; alleging as his reason for doing so, that the conductors of that periodical, as well as most of its supporters, did not agree with him in approving of the *Marrow* doctrine.—It is said that the late Mr M'Cheyne of Dundee, traced his conversion to the perusal of the sum of saving knowledge ! The Holy Spirit, no doubt, is sovereign in the use of the means which he blesses for conversion ; but it is difficult to imagine anything more unlike the style of M'Cheyne's preaching, than the cold and stiff dialectics of that *summa theologiæ*.

that in England, its native soil, Anglo-Puritanism should have developed itself into extreme forms. In most evangelical pulpits there, within and without the pale of the establishment, the doctrine of universal redemption, which the Marrow condemns, is openly promulgated and warmly advocated; and with this is very frequently connected the old heresy of Universal Grace.

It would be a hopeless task to attempt a reconciliation between these extreme views, and what we account the doctrine which is according to godliness. No such task do we now undertake. We propose to deal simply with the two schools or systems which we have designated Scoto-Calvinism and Anglo-Puritanism; and the special point of diversity between them to which we shall turn our attention is that of the Atonement, viewed in connection with the general offers and invitations of the gospel, and the office of saving faith in compliance with them.

We feel persuaded that amongst Evangelical parties, in Scotland at least, there is an essential agreement upon these points; but, from the circumstances already mentioned, there is doubtless a diversity of style and statement in regard to them, which seems to require adjustment. To this object the remainder of our article will be devoted. Our attempt to point out a *via media* between the two methods of exhibiting the truth, whatever may be its success, is made at least in the most friendly spirit towards both parties; and it is surely desirable that in opposing the rampant heresies of the day, there should be a perfect mutual understanding among the friends of evangelical truth.

Much confusion and misunderstanding, we are seriously persuaded, arises from not adverting to the different aspects under which the atonement is presented in Scripture—aspects not depending on the objects in behalf of whom it was offered, but springing out of the very nature of the atonement made by the Son of God. These aspects may be reduced to three, and admit of being classified under the three figures by which it was typified under the ancient economy, namely, the Priest who offered, the Sacrifice which was offered, and the Altar on which the blood was sprinkled. Under the law, owing to its weakness, three types were necessary to give a full idea of the atonement. In Christ all the three coincide and are verified; for he is at once priest, sacrifice, and altar. Still, however, in order to a full conception of the work, the threefold idea, which, under the law, was exhibited to the eye of the worshipper, must be present to the faith of the Christian. In other words, we must regard it at once under the aspect of the Priest offer-

ing the sacrifice, of the Sacrifice which was offered, and of the Altar that is sprinkled with its blood. Under all these aspects is the atonement represented in Scripture ; and each of them has its own significance, preaches its own lessons, and suggests its own improvement.

1. The atonement may be viewed as offered by Christ our great high priest. The type under the Old Testament must have been peculiarly striking. There, in his gorgeous robes of office, with the fair mitre on his head, and the mystic Urim and Thummim on his breast, stood Aaron, the holy one, and priest of the most high God. To him alone pertained the office of presenting the sacrifice, and appearing with its blood before the divine presence. To him that vast crowd of worshippers looked up as their sole representative, for "he bare upon his heart the names of the children of Israel." Everything marked the special and definite destination of the persons in whose name he appeared. "And the stones shall be with the names of the children of Israel, twelve, according to their names, like the engravings of a signet ; every one with his name shall they be, according to the twelve tribes." And, as if this were not enough, the same names were engraven on the two stones upon the shoulders of the ephod, that Aaron might bear their names upon his two shoulders for a memorial.—Exod. xxviii.

Let us then consider Christ as our great High Priest. Viewed in this light he was active and voluntary, as his Father's servant in behalf of his chosen people, fulfilling all righteousness as their representative, and appearing before God bearing their names upon his heart, and their sins upon his shoulders. From this point of contemplation we are irresistibly led to think of the purpose of election, and of the special love of God in Christ towards the company of the redeemed, of the promises given to the son in the everlasting covenant, of the security of the elect, and the sureness of redemption. Allusions to all these points abound in Scripture. The inspired epistles are full of them. If this view of the atonement be ignored, what sense can be assigned to such passages as the following : "For their sakes I sanctify myself." "Christ loved the church, and gave himself for it." "Unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood." And what are we to make of the sublime language of Paul in the 8th of the Romans ? "Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect ? It is God that justifieth, who is he that condemneth ? It is Christ that died. Who shall separate us from the love of Christ ?" To regard this love as general and undistinguishing, and as only manifested towards the individual because shining like the light of the sun at noonday indiscriminately upon all, is a view equally

foreign to Scripture, and unknown to Christian experience. The apostle speaks of separation from the love of Christ as a thing impossible ; but if we are to suppose that the whole race is included within the embrace of this love, the idea of being separated from it, so far from being an impossibility, must be allowed to hold true in regard to multitudes every day.

And may we not appeal with confidence to the experience of every Christian man and woman, when led by the spirit of adoption to claim a part in the love of Christ ; do they really conceive of it as a love common to them, and to the men of the world, who have their portion only in this life ? do they think of it as smiling equally on them as it does upon every individual of the human race ? On the contrary, is not the sovereignty of that love, in fixing upon them as its object, the source of wonder, gratitude, and praise, to every soul unto whom it has been revealed, as it was to Paul, when he said, "It pleased God, who separated me from my mother's womb, and called me by his grace, to reveal his Son in me ?" To attempt to disjoin this special grace from the work of the atonement—to cut the love of God into two parts—a general love in atoning for sinners, and a special love in converting sinners, is an expedient obviously suggested by a desire to uphold a favourite theory, or to reconcile expressions in Scripture which may seem to be contradictory. There is no occasion for such an expedient. Nor is there any ground in Scripture for distinguishing the saving love of Christ into general and special. No, let us take it as it stands in Scripture, one and indivisible and like himself, "the same to-day, yesterday, and for ever."

The only passage which seems to countenance the distinction above referred to, is 1 Tim. iv. 10, "The living God who is the Saviour of all men, but especially of them that believe." Without entering into the exegesis of this passage, we beg simply to say, that from the context it appears to us most plainly to refer to God in his character, not as the Redeemer, but as the preserver of men ; in which character, while "good unto all men," he is specially gracious to them that trust in him. "O Lord, thou preservest man and beast, how excellent is thy loving-kindness." We are aware that the phraseology in question is often employed to signify nothing more than what we shall immediately notice, namely, the death of Christ viewed by itself apart from the design of Christ in dying. But is there no danger of its being understood to teach that the death of Christ had two very different designs ? that he died to purchase, in general, *salvability for all*, and, especially, to purchase *salvation for some* ? Would it not be better then, for the interests of truth, to drop this mode of expression ?

But, while we cannot ignore this aspect of the atonement,

without doing grievous injustice to the mystery of redemption as revealed in Scripture, it is quite possible to give it a place of such undue prominence or exclusiveness, as to overlook or greatly to obscure the other aspects under which that mystery is presented. This charge undoubtedly applies to the Sum which we have been examining, as indeed, it holds true of many of the systems of divinity produced in the 17th century, in which the atonement is only treated incidentally, under the general head of the offices executed by Christ as Mediator. In accordance with this mode, so common at the time, we have no distinct chapter in our Confession of Faith, and no separate question in our Catechisms on the Atonement of Christ. The practical effect of this mode of treatment need hardly be pointed out. It tends to circumscribe our views of the glorious work of Christ, by presenting it only on one of its sides ; it leaves many portions of Scripture bearing on the nature, the necessity, the value, and the efficacy of the atonement unexplained ; and keeping the eye fixed on the intentions of Christ in dying, it necessarily prevents us from forming true conceptions of the death itself. The current of religious thought in the present day runs very strongly in the direction of the Person of Christ as the central object of contemplation. We hail this as upon the whole auguring well for the cause of Christianity ; but it ought never to be forgotten, that the ground of our hope of pardon and eternal life is not the person of Christ *per se*, but the work of atonement which that blessed person accomplished in the fulness of the time.

This suggests another thought. The idea of Election is unhappily identified in certain minds with that of *selection*. They cannot conceive of it in any other light than that of an arbitrary act of the divine will, picking and choosing out some from the many as the objects of his grace. But the election of any, though it no doubt infers the non-election of the rest, is in itself an act of pure love, and of love in its highest form. When we are told that John was "the disciple whom Jesus loved," we do not think of this as an act of arbitrary selection. He loved all his own, but his love to John was special and distinguishing. When a man elects his bride, he is not generally said to have *selected* her as the object of his affection. Election is, in fact, the maximum of love ; it is benevolence carried to its highest point of intensity : "I have loved thee with an everlasting love ; therefore with loving-kindness have I drawn thee." In fine, electing love must be regarded, not merely as giving birth and origin to the plan of redemption, but as its consummation. It is the apex as well as the base of the mighty scheme ; all the blessings of salvation culminate in it as their cope-stone. The love that swept its way from the past eternity, the love

that stooped down from heaven to earth, to lift us up from the pit of destruction, is the same love which will beam with delight on the redeemed in glory, and which, while they gaze upon it, will constitute their eternal blessedness.

2. Again, the atonement may be viewed under the aspect of the *sacrifice* offered. "Behold," said John, pointing to him in the days of his flesh, "the Lamb of God which taketh away the sins of the world." He represents him here, not as the priest, but as the sacrifice—as the Lamb slain. Such, also, is Paul's representation, "Christ our passover is sacrificed for us." Viewed in this light, we are called to contemplate, not the intentions of the offerer, but the value and dignity of the thing offered. The eye of faith, looking at the atonement from this point of view, has no respect to the persons in whose behalf it was presented—to the purposes of God regarding them, or to the special love borne towards them by the Redeemer. It looks simply and solely to the vast unbounded merit of the sacrifice itself, and that not as offered by a divine person, but as the divine person offered; for the dignity of the officiating priest, however high, could never have imparted a meritorious value to the sacrifice, unless that sacrifice had of itself been intrinsically, essentially, divinely worthy. From the mysterious constitution of his person, it flowed that Christ himself was at once the priest and the sacrifice. Our great High Priest came "to take away sin by the sacrifice of himself." Viewed under this aspect, we are not called to answer the question, For whom was the sacrifice ultimately designed—for some, or for all? Enough that it was a sacrifice for sin in behalf of mankind sinners. "Christ came into the world to save sinners." The vicarious character of the death of Christ is indeed plainly indicated by the very term sacrifice; but viewed simply as a sacrifice, it does not indicate its special destination in regard to its objects. Its proper and formal end was the satisfaction of divine justice. No doubt its ultimate end was through that satisfaction to effect our redemption; but still, viewed simply, and *per se*, the sacrifice had respect to God, and not to man. What rendered it necessary was the eternal justice of heaven, which demanded satisfaction. That satisfaction has been made by the offering up of the body of Christ once for all; and what we are called to contemplate is the fulness and perfection of the satisfaction, not the particular persons for whom it was destined. Hence the language in our standards on the subject is studiously indefinite: "Christ executeth the office of a priest in his once offering up of himself a sacrifice to satisfy divine justice, and to reconcile us to God." Here we have the sacrifice of Christ represented, both in its primary and its ultimate object. The primary object was to "satisfy divine justice." It is not

said that Christ satisfied divine justice for the elect only, or for all men. The moment that we introduce either of these phrases into the definition of the atonement, viewed as a sacrifice, we lose sight of its primary object, and involve the subject in controversy and confusion. The question immediately rises, In what sense can he have been said to have satisfied justice for some and not for all? And if he has satisfied justice for all, how comes it that he has not thereby reconciled all men to God? It has been commonly answered, that Christ by his death has removed the bar of justice, and thus opened the door of mercy to all mankind. To this phraseology, however, the great objection is, that it expresses either too much or too little. If it means that Christ has satisfied all the claims of justice in behalf of mankind, it obviously expresses too much; for it cannot be held in any sense compatible with Scripture that Christ has, by his death, made a full and perfect satisfaction for the sins of those who shall ultimately perish, unless we suppose that justice demands double satisfaction, first, in the person of Christ; and next, in the persons of sinners themselves. Or the phrase in question expresses too little, and it must be understood to mean that the design of the death of Christ was not to satisfy divine justice so completely that it could no longer demand satisfaction from us, but merely that he satisfied it so far as to render salvation possible;—that he died, not to deliver us out of the hands of justice, but merely to remove an obstacle which stood in the way of our deliverance. The whole difficulty vanishes when we regard the atonement in the light of the sacrifice, irrespectively of the persons in whose behalf it was offered. Viewed in and by itself, the death of Christ was a full and perfect satisfaction to divine justice; and regarded in this light, the satisfaction is limited only by the person of Christ, but then the merit of it, dwelling as it does in him, can only become available for human justification in and through him. In other words, it is only in Christ that divine justice can be seen or found in a state of satisfaction, and it is only through him that the merit of that satisfaction can avail for the justification of the ungodly. The word of reconciliation runs in these terms:—“God is *in Christ* reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing unto men their trespasses.” Outside of Christ, no satisfaction has been made, no bar of justice removed, no door of mercy opened. He is the door of mercy, and wherever Christ is preached, that door is opened to sinners. “Without Christ,” men are as the Ephesians were, “aliens and strangers, having no hope, and without God in the world.”

But while avoiding that mode of teaching, which would represent the death of Christ as satisfying justice for all, it is

surely possible to exhibit that death as containing in itself a full and perfect satisfaction to justice. Is not this in reality the very gospel which we are commanded to preach to every creature—an all-sufficient Saviour, an infinitely perfect atonement for sin? Is it not, viewing the death of Christ under this aspect, that we call upon all men to trust in him for salvation? And is it not, under this aspect, that saving faith fixes itself upon him with fiducial reliance? “I know whom I have believed,” says Paul, “and I am persuaded” (not that I am an elect one, no, not even that I am a true believer; but “I am persuaded) that *he is able* to keep that which I have committed unto him.” Space will not allow us to specify the numerous passages which are covered by this view of the atonement. Suffice it to say, that wherever the terms “sacrifice,” “atonement,” “propitiation,” are employed, they are plainly to be viewed in this light. Wherever they occur, two grand ideas are suggested,—the oneness and the sufficiency of the sacrifice,—ideas mutually involving each other. It is one, because it is perfect; and because it is perfect, it is but one. Hence the universal terms so frequently applied to it—“One died for all;” there is but one sacrifice for all; one atonement alone available for human justification. “He is the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world.” Considered by itself, it is the only propitiation by which the sins of the world can be forgiven, and it is sufficient for the whole sins of the whole world.

3. But we have not obtained a complete view of the atonement, as presented in the Scriptures, unless we contemplate it also under the aspect of the Altar on which the blood of the sacrifice is seen sprinkled. Under the law, after the sacrifice was slain, the priest took and sprinkled its blood on the altar, saying, “This is the blood of the covenant which the Lord your God hath made with you.” This blood-besprinkled altar betokened the perpetual virtue and efficacy of the sacrifice of Christ. Hence the frequent references in the New Testament to the “blood of Christ,” which is distinguished in some respects from his sacrifice. The sacrifice of Christ was offered “once for all;” the idea of its repetition or continuance, whether in the popish mass, or under the pretended modifications of modern ritualism, is wholly alien to Scripture, inconsistent with the absolute perfection of the sacrifice of Calvary, and deeply dishonouring to him who offered it on the cross. But the blood of Christ may be said to remain in the perpetual merit and validity of the sacrifice. We cannot come to the sacrifice, but we can all come to the altar; we can all come to the blood of sprinkling. “Christ being dead dieth no more;” but the blood once shed may still be seen sprinkled upon

the altar of the everlasting gospel. "We *have* an altar," says Paul. "The blood of Jesus Christ," says John, "*cleanseth* us from all sin." It is still cleansing, and will continue to cleanse to the end of time. This blood, as exhibited in the gospel, is the proper object of saving faith; for, as faith always bears a relation to the divine testimony, it can only be as exhibited in the doctrine, promises and invitations of the gospel that faith can approach to and appropriate it. "Whom God hath set forth a propitiation, through faith in his blood for the forgiveness of sins."

Viewed under this aspect, we verily believe that there prevails amongst Christian believers of every church and sect, the most perfect unanimity. On the action of Christ as a priest, and even on the specific character of the sacrifice, there may be much variance and logomachy. But over the words of John, "The blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth from all sin," they will all join hands in cordial and complete agreement. In the *Marrow of Modern Divinity* there occurs a phrase which cost honest Boston a long note to explain in a sense compatible with his ideas of orthodoxy. It is to this effect: "Though we cannot say to every one, *Christ died for thee*, yet to every one we may say, *Christ is dead for thee*." The expression is quaint and somewhat paradoxical, but we feel sure that the writer intended nothing more than to express this third aspect of the atonement,—namely, as the blood of Christ in distinction from the sacrifice, and from the act of Christ in offering it up. In the call to believe on Christ, addressed to every sinner, we do not point him to the special intentions of Christ in dying, nor to the design of the sacrifice itself as a satisfaction to divine justice, but Christ having once died, the just for the unjust, we point him to the blood of the victim offered as able to cleanse him from all sin; and as this blood is exhibited in the free and universal offers of the gospel, we may most warrantably say, This blood is for thee; it is offered to thee for thy use and appropriation. "The fountain is opened to the house of David and the inhabitants of Jerusalem for sin and for uncleanness."

Another source of much confusion and misapprehension on this subject may be traced to the use of the term *satisfaction*. This term, though not to be found in Scripture, and transmitted from the days of Anselm, may doubtless be employed in a sense undeniably true and scriptural; but there is reason to fear that, to some, it conveys a restricted view of the work of redemption. With them it seems to indicate that Christ, by his sufferings and death, paid only a portion of the debt due to divine justice,—that portion, namely, which was due by those persons in whose name he acted, and whose ultimate

redemption was secured by his death. This, we need hardly say, indicates a commercial conception of the work of Christ, as if he had paid so much for one and so much for another, and as if, for so much suffering, the Father was willing to grant him so many souls. This low and degrading view of the atonement has been generally discarded ; but if we persist in looking upon it as simply a satisfaction to justice, we are in great danger of falling into this conclusion. The truth is, the atonement of our Lord did infinitely more than satisfy the claims of justice ; it shed a halo of glory around that attribute. The Lord is more than satisfied, "He is well pleased for his righteousness sake, for he hath magnified the law and made it honourable." The divine character of the victim imparted to the sacrifice an incalculable and unlimited, because an infinite value ; and it is upon the ground of this infinite value of the sacrifice, which would have sufficed for the redemption of all, and not on the ground of any previous purpose, or preordination of individuals, that God confers upon any the blessings of justification and eternal life. The believer is justified, not because he was the object of God's eternal choice, but because he believeth on the name of his Son Jesus Christ. The formal ground of his justification is not that he was in the eye of Christ, when dying on the cross, as one of those for whom he paid a certain price, but that he, a sinner, is found in Christ, trusting to his all-perfect righteousness for salvation. "There is therefore now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus." There is indeed a blessed sense in which believers are taught to regard themselves as "bought with a price ;" but this figurative expression holds true only in regard to the *persons* of believers, and to them as sprinkled with his blood, or interested in the blessing of redemption, and cannot be construed to mean anything like a mere mercantile transaction. When we are said to be redeemed, not with corruptible things, such as silver and gold, but with the precious blood of Christ, the meaning is, not that we should regard the inheritance of life as something purchased from the Father in exchange for something paid by the Son, but that we should regard ourselves as under eternal obligations to the blood of Christ, as in itself infinitely precious, and therefore worthy of being rewarded, not only by our redemption, but by the everlasting praises of the whole company of the redeemed.

Taking the views of the atonement which we have now suggested, we can be at no loss to discover the perfect consistency and reasonableness of the general calls and invitations to sinners with which the Word of God abounds. That the minister of the gospel is warranted to invite all, without exception or qualification, to embrace the Saviour and all saving benefits

in him, is now so universally granted, that it is quite needless to dwell on this part of the subject. Let us only say, that much of the effect of such invitations depends upon the spirit and manner in which they are announced. The controversial spirit must be carefully eschewed. Too many, we fear, introduce the free and generous offers of salvation only that they may have a fling at election, and an opportunity of airing their views about universal redemption. Others, again, it is to be equally feared, neutralise the effect of their evangelical teaching by throwing in saving clauses and conditions intended to guard themselves on the side of a nervous orthodoxy. It is painful to think there should be a moment's hesitancy in the mind of any faithful preacher respecting the duty of proclaiming the overtures of mercy to perishing sinners, and that as freely and fully as words can express. The everlasting doors of salvation can never be flung open too widely ; the " Ho ! every one that thirsteth " of the prophet ; the " Come unto me all ye that labour and are heavy laden " of the Saviour, are calls which can never be addressed unsuitably to any audience, however large or promiscuous it may be ; for all men are thirsting for something better than they possess, and all men, God knoweth, are too heavy laden not to need the rest which Christ has provided. But it is still more painful to hear, as we have too often heard, these precious invitations announced in the midst of a noisy display of polemical fireworks. If anything which we have advanced in this paper should tend to abate such a disposition, and to bring the utterances of the evangelical pulpit into more kindly harmony on this point, our labour will be amply rewarded. And why should it not be possible to preach a full-orbed gospel, as Paul does in his Epistle to the Romans, without attempting to square the circle by drawing parallel lines to suit our ideas of consistency, and without chaffering about the terms on which we will consent to offer Christ to sinners ?

The authoritative ground on which the general call of the gospel is founded is, without doubt, the *divine command*. Christ has expressly enjoined us to " preach the gospel to every creature ; " and this command, whether given in express words, or involved in the examples and metaphors of Scripture, is our proper, and, indeed, our only *warrant* for addressing to every sinner the offer of salvation through Christ. But the service of God under the gospel is a " reasonable service " ; and the obedience which He requires from His servants is not the blind obedience of the slave to the commands of his master, or the unreasoning obedience of the child to the will of the parent. " All his commandments are done in truth and uprightness. " He is pleased to " reason together " with us, and to convince

us of the reasonableness, the propriety, and becomingness of the duties he enjoins.

In the present case, the reasonableness of the command to preach the gospel to every creature, may be argued from various considerations. In particular, it clearly flows as an inference from the *all-sufficiency* of the atonement provided. If the sacrifice of Christ is in and of itself sufficient for the salvation of all, it is but right and reasonable that it should be offered unto all. Its infinite intrinsic value furnishes ample reason for the divine command, and ample ground for justifying the Christian minister in complying with it. In both cases, the atonement must be regarded under the aspect of the sacrifice that has been offered, without reference to the intentions and purposes of God. To allege anything like insincerity on the part of God, in offering to all what was not meant for all, is to advance a charge which would apply with equal force to the arrangements of his common providence, according to which, while abundant provision is made for all, the duty of every man to make use of that provision for the ends for which it was designed, stands unaffected by the secret purpose of heaven in regard to the individual, who may be finally destined never to profit by it. With regard to the preacher, he has obviously nothing to do with the secret councils of the Most High. In discharging the grateful task of inviting, in the name of his Master, all around him, in the streets and lanes of the city, the by-ways and the hedges, to come to the marriage feast, he must not only be conscious of fulfilling his Master's will, but encouraged by knowing that abundant provision has been made for all.

In conclusion, we have only a word or two to say as to the function of faith, viewed in relation to the atonement, under the aspects now presented. We have spoken of Christ as the priest, the sacrifice, and the altar. In this arrangement, we have followed what divines have called the order of time, according to which the purposes of God come first, the purchased redemption next, and the application of it last. But, it is obvious that, in the order of nature or actual experience, this arrangement must be inverted. In the day of conversion, the Spirit of God, when applying the work of Christ to the soul, begins with the word of God, in which Christ is exhibited as the altar, or, in other words, points to the blood of Christ as shed for many for the remission of sins. And, in like manner, faith fixes, in its first and more immediate action, upon this aspect of the atonement. Trembling under a sense of guilt, conscious of evil desert, and ready to sink into despair, the newly-awakened sinner sees the blood of the Son of God, which cleanseth from all sin, brought nigh to him, within the range

of his vision, and within reach of his hand, in the everlasting gospel. That sight, once obtained, "dispels the fears of guilt and woe." A sacrifice for sin, it appears, has been provided, presented, and accepted; and here its merit and virtue are proffered for the benefit of all. Faith looks to the testimony of God in his word as its proper warrant and foundation. From this the step is easy to the sacrifice that was laid on the altar. As the word of God is the foundation on which faith is built, so Christ crucified, as revealed in that word, is the object on which it rests; and in the fulness and perfection of his atoning work, faith finds a resting-place where it may be shaken indeed, but from whence it never can be dislodged. At this stage the soul is secure in a state of salvation. But another step is needful to attain the joy of that salvation. The faith of affiance rises into that of appropriation, and viewing the atonement, on which alone he rests for pardon and peace, holiness and heaven, as offered up by the great High Priest, he claims him as his own Saviour, and can say with the apostle, "I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me." Thus, through faith realising the atonement, under all its aspects, the soul reaches "all joy and peace in believing." And the old promise is fulfilled, "Thou shalt keep him in perfect peace whose mind is stayed upon thee; because he trusteth in thee."

We are greatly mistaken if, in these statements, we do not express, though in feeble and imperfect language, the uniform experience of the children of God. Varied as that experience is by the accidents of time, tongue, and person, it is, and has ever been, in substance the same. Among the numerous examples of this which crowd upon us as we now write, there is one with which, as it happens to be nearest us, we shall close these remarks. It is that of the Rev. John Cowper, of whose conversion to evangelical views on his death-bed, such a beautiful account has been left by his brother, the Christian poet.

The experience of this young man is the more remarkable as being that of a scholar and a gentleman, who, though of the purest and sweetest natural disposition, yet remained, till within a few days of his death, totally blind to the divine beauty and excellency of the gospel. It is of him that Cowper says—

"I had a brother once.
Peace to the memory of a man of worth,
A man of letters, and of manners too!—
Of manners sweet, as virtue always wears,
When gay good nature dresses her in smiles."

The first thing that marked his conversion was a discovery of Christ as revealed and offered to him in the doctrine of the

gospel. All at once he stepped out of darkness into God's marvellous light. "The doctrines I had been used to," he said, "referred me to *myself* for the foundation of my hopes, and there I could find nothing to rest upon. The sheet-anchor of the soul was wanting. I hope he has taught me that which he teaches none but his own. These things were foolishness to me once, but now I have a firm foundation, and am satisfied. I have learned *that* in a moment which I could not have learned by reading many books for many years." Identical with this, yet clearly flowing from a view of the all-sufficiency of the Saviour, came the assurance of faith, which he thus expressed:—"Were I to die this night," he said, "I know I should be happy. This assurance, I hope, is quite consistent with the word of God. It is built upon a sense of my utter insufficiency, and the ALL-SUFFICIENCY of Christ." And lastly, the assurance of faith, coupled as it always is with personal appropriation, rose into the assurance of sense; and, mounting upward from the altar to the sacrifice, and from the sacrifice to the priest, his soul realised the eternal love of God his Saviour, and gave vent to its feelings in a flood of holy joy. "Brother, I am as happy as a king. What a mercy it is to a man in my condition *to know* his acceptance; I am completely satisfied of mine." And then, after acknowledging the goodness of God in discovering unto him, though late, the plan of redemption, he added, "But the crown of all his mercies is this, that he has given me a Saviour, and not only the Saviour of mankind, brother, but MY SAVIOUR."*

ART. III.—*The Temple and the Synagogue.*

MOST men in our day profess their eagerness to submit their systems and their modes of thought to the test of first principles. Practically, however, it is difficult to renounce a long cherished error, and some are disposed against all reason rather to reassert and to maintain it, with such exaggerations as they hope may give it a new lease of existence.

We can hardly divest ourselves of the idea that this explains the policy of the Romanising party in the Church of England, who, having seen the timid demonstrations of former times

* On the assurance of faith, our readers will find some further remarks made in a notice of the work entitled "The Increase of Faith," contained in the Critical Notices of the present Number.—ED.

made abortive by the progress of controversy, are now vigorously pushing their practices to extremes, which a few years ago would have been thought impossible, in the hope that they may, by their boldness and courage, secure for their darling ritual an advantage which no merits of its own could have obtained. The symbols of the ancient superstition are again set up. The Protestant spirit—once the glory of the Church of England—is denounced and repudiated. And we are instructed how that church should be organised anew, in accordance with traditions of anti-reformation times. Evangelical doctrine and worship are contemptuously disowned, and wherever practicable, the sensuous in worship is placed above the simplicity of the New Testament.

The advocates of this strange retrogression profess to appeal to antiquity ; but it is a very modern antiquity, whatever in their usual vague manner they profess.

They do not, because they cannot, refer in support of their principles to any one authentic document of the two first centuries. If they put their finger on the professed epistles of Ignatius (the only documents now attributed to these centuries that could be quoted as favouring their cause), we challenge the genuineness of these, which is disproved by all modern investigations, while we deny that if they did belong to the age and authorship which they claim, they could fairly be used in support of the monstrous pretensions which the party puts forward.

We must look much later in the history of the church for any fair precedent for recognising a priestly character in ministers bearing the name of Christians.

We have no objection to go back to antiquity. Indeed, this is what we insist on. Not the antiquity of Laud, certainly, nor of the Nicene Council, nor even of the early centuries, for why should we be content with any authority so modern as these, when we have the writings of apostles inviting us to consult and follow them ? Next to saving souls, they took care of the proper organisation of the church. But how did they organise ? Not in such a fashion, or on such principles, as the Romanising party recommends. Their whole proceedings were as simple and as natural as possible. At first they were themselves the preachers, the rulers, the almoners of the church. Very soon, like Moses in the wilderness, they laid^o first one part and then another of their duty, upon substitutes or coadjutors, that they might give themselves to that part of their work more specially apostolic. Their earliest care secured attention to the poor, by the election of deacons, Then, soon after, elders are found in active work ; for when Paul and Barnabas, after their return from their first missionary tour, car-

ried the alms of the Antioch Christians to Jerusalem, the field was already occupied by a trusted eldership; and from that time forward, in every region to which the gospel came, and in every community where the word was successfully preached, the first care of the apostles was the appointment of elders.

Now, in all this history, what place do we find for high-church and ritualistic ideas, such as those advocated in our day by certain parties in the Established Church? Not in the actions of the apostles, who claimed nothing, who exacted nothing, except what was fairly due to their inspired and peculiar position. They often joined in the ordination of others, but for this purpose they assumed no prelatic power. They were themselves ordained, but as history informs us, by other presbyters. Very little indeed is said about their ordination, and of most of them the ordination was not even noticed. In one case, that of Paul and Barnabas, some particulars are recorded, and a list of persons given as their ordainers, Acts xiii. Among these, we find men well known in the Church, but we discover no diocesan bishop or prelate. They were "Simeon, who is called Niger, and Lucius of Cyrene, and Manaen," the foster brother and early companion of the tetrarch Herod, no one of whom assumed prelatic power or authority. This ordination, like Timothy's afterwards, was that of a presbytery. No doubt these ordainers were bishops in the New Testament sense of the word. But in the sense adopted, either ignorantly or "economically," by the high church or ritualistic party, no such functionary was present, or indeed can be shewn at the time to have existed anywhere. Very little importance evidently was then attached to the circumstances of ordination. It seems to have been enough, that by this act on the part of the church through her rulers, ordination had been *bonâ fide* administered; and it is remarkable that there does not exist in written history or authentic tradition, any record to tell us by whose hands the numerous other presbyters received ordination, nor which were the ministers, missionaries or pastors, whom any one of the apostles ordained, or joined in ordaining. Nor can we find, except in monkish legends, any information as to the early episcopal succession in any one of the ancient churches, so that, notwithstanding the bold language used on the subject, it would certainly puzzle any of our modern high church divines, to give us their own ecclesiastical pedigree. All who reverence truth will agree with us, that no evidence on this subject is within their reach so strong as would satisfy a jury to bring in a verdict establishing a legal right to the most paltry piece of property.

For our own part, we would esteem it a very idle attempt

in any real successor of the apostles,—for we gladly acknowledge that such do exist, and deserve the respect and consideration of all good men,—to endeavour to justify a pretension of this kind on such a ground, and one quite out of keeping with the apostolic spirit; for that spirit is directly hostile to those “endless genealogies,” which Paul denounced, and which such a pretence necessarily involves. If priestly assumptions are lawful, if they are esteemed necessary to be maintained by ministers of the Church of England, for example, in order to make valid the claims of that church to catholicity, then, indeed, an investigation of this kind must be made, and the claims of every individual clergyman must be subjected to it.

Priestly assumptions on the part of Christian Ecclesiastics necessarily must rest on some alleged analogy with those of the Aaronic Priesthood, and this the strictest anglican will not deny. But that priesthood claimed its privileges, simply and fundamentally, on the ground of its natural descent from Aaron. After the return from Babylon, as we learn from Ezra ii. 61 and Nehemiah vii. 64, a rigid inquiry was deemed necessary as to the pretensions of every person acting as a priest in the newly returned community, and this was conducted simply by a careful scrutiny of the registers. Certain acting priests “sought their register among those that were reckoned by genealogy, but they were not found; therefore were they, as polluted, put from the priesthood.” This defect in their title was fatal, and they were necessarily blotted from the lists of the temple. If the anglican claim, therefore, is of this character, so must the investigation be, and it is plainly impossible to assert with reason any priestly title which will not stand this test.

Dr Hook, far from shrinking from this test, boldly appeals to it. “Our ordinations,” he says, “descend in an unbroken line from Peter and Paul, the apostles of the circumcision and the Gentiles. There is not a bishop, or priest, or deacon among us, who may not, if he please, trace his spiritual descent from Peter and Paul.” To which another writer adds,—“Every link in the chain is known from Peter to our present metropolitan.” This language sufficiently shows the pretensions of the party, but it amounts to nothing. It is only the bold assumption of reckless counsel in a plea, open to contradiction by his opponent, and liable to be weighed and sifted by legal evidence. Where, then, are the proofs? Open the registers, and let us commence a search. You claim from Peter and Paul. Let us settle, first of all, then, who were Peter and Paul. Did they assert themselves to be prelates or bishops, in the High Church sense of that word, or were they such? No; they were apostles inspired and gifted as such, some were

bishops or overseers of flocks, and all of them were presbyters. These names they took, but they never called themselves prelates; and when inspiration and miraculous gifts ceased in the Christian church,—as one by one their limited number died out,—the apostolic office ceased also; for in that office they had no successors. In their doctrine, and in that presbyterial character which Peter claims, every true minister of Christ is their successor. In any prelatic or priestly sense, the apostles had, and could have, no successors, simply because they neither were, nor pretended to be themselves prelates or priests.

But, returning to the registers, what do we find there? Suppose this claim of apostolic descent to be really worth all that is asserted, it must not be made in any vague manner, as if, for example, it could be derived from the apostles generally, or from some apostle unknown; but it must be derived by each priest from at least one specific apostle, to whom the claimant can trace back, link by link, his ecclesiastical pedigree, till that apostle is reached (as Aaron was by each Jewish priest, through the registers), he being the head and fountain from which has flowed the consecrating influence that gives him his priesthood and power. Dr Hook says, that from Peter *and* Paul the Anglican clergy can, without exception, trace their ecclesiastical origin. To make good this assertion he must be prepared with two distinct lines of descent; but supposing him to mean Peter *or* Paul, the candid inquirer will still esteem this much too indefinite. Tell us, Dr Hook, from which of these apostles, if only from one, you, for example, derive your church standing? If from Paul, then tell us through which of his immediate ecclesiastical descendants your pretensions come. Let us know also the evidence on which you assert that this apostle really did ordain such successor,—when, and where. Tell us next, *seriatim*, with satisfactory detail, who succeeded him throughout those long eighteen centuries that followed, till at the end of the series yourself came forth from under your ordaining bishop's hand, a true ecclesiastical descendant of the apostle. This evidence is indispensable, and we know you cannot furnish it; for, unquestionably, no such evidence anywhere exists. The inspired history which might have recorded the earliest links is absolutely silent, and beyond this authentic field, all that literature has preserved on this topic is mysterious, uncertain, and traditional, and, from the earliest times, has always been disputed. Or, again, do you claim through Peter? We shall find in this case the same result. It is true there exists at Rome a register, very evidently forged ages after facts had faded away, and suited to colour the then rising Romish pretensions. It has been often disputed and proved fabulous; but still it runs

smoothly enough at the first:—Peter, Linus, Cletus or Anacletus, Clement, Evaristus, Alexander, &c. It has answered its purpose among the *élèves* of Douai and Maynooth, but to intelligent inquirers all is as dark and uncertain on this subject as if this register had no existence, though our inquiry needs that it should be clear and undeniable as the registers of the Jewish temple. And when we think that it is still a point of controversy whether Peter was ever at Rome at all; and that till this point be settled we need not begin to dispute whether or not he was a prelate; and farther, that till both these points are satisfactorily adjusted, the many hard questions regarding the ordinations effected by him, and regarding the numerous other links in the chain, need not be considered; that, besides, if the inquiry into these were instituted, the only authorities extant are of the most untrustworthy character, leaving us no higher evidence for the most essential particulars than monkish tradition,—when we remember that the inquiry must be carried down through dark ages, the traces of whose history are faintly and confusedly drawn by ignorance and imbecility,—ages in which bishops were habitually disputing the rights of bishops, and the orders of many churches were absolutely denied,—when we recollect that the claims of many heretics were as good as those of the orthodox, and that, were it possible, at the present day, for any man to establish the ground of claim now in dispute, he might, after all, be no better than a heretic, worthy of supremest censure, and to be avoided by all Christian men,—we ask, to what do these pretensions amount? Only to a miserable and futile attempt, on the part of certain Churchmen, to assume a position to which they can have no more shadow of real right, than Herod had to possess “the voice of a god and not of a man,” because he was foolish and impious enough to claim it.

The Church of England, as yet, seems to countenance no such absurd claims. Its prominent parties, indeed, though differing as to the exact weight to be attributed to their prelatic character, demand much for *prelacy*; and we regret at times to have observed, even in some of the evangelical clergy, a tendency to assume that there exists in prelacy a certain superiority over all other systems, giving them an exclusive claim to churchmanship, and clothing their ecclesiastical position with an excellence which the actual history of the Church and the spirit of the New Testament, in every book and epistle, deny and rebuke. This tendency, no doubt, has been fostered by the privileges and immunities which, in this country, are accorded to the Established Church, and are probably more accidental than inherent. But the more than clerical arrogance which appears among the ritualistic party, must not

be attributed to the Church of England, or to the Evangelical clergy of the Establishment. The strange degeneracy to which we allude does not always go unrebuked,—the ridiculous presumption of the Romanizing clergy does not always escape the well-deserved lash of great and good men within the Church's pale. Articles have from time to time appeared, even in these pages, giving no uncertain sound on such topics, whose authorship is due to the talent and principle of eminent Churchmen.

“There is not a minister in all Christendom,” says Archbishop Whately, “who is able to trace up, with any approach to certainty, his own spiritual pedigree.” “The ultimate consequence” (of the acceptance of these views) “must be, that any one who sincerely believes that his claim to the benefits of the gospel-covenant depends on his own minister's claim to the supposed sacramental virtue of true ordination, and this again on apostolic succession, must be involved, in proportion as he reads, and inquires, and reflects, and reasons on the subject, in the most distressing doubt and perplexity. It is no wonder, therefore, that the advocates of this theory studiously disparage reasoning, deprecate all exercise of the mind in reflection, decry appeals to evidence, and lament that even the power of reading should be imparted to the people. It is not without cause that they dread and lament an age of too much light, and wish to involve religion in a solemn and awful gloom. It is not without cause that, having removed the Christian's confidence from a rock to base it on sand, they forbid all prying curiosity to examine the foundations.”

Leaving all retrograde sacerdotalists to reflect on these and similar sensible remarks of their fellow-churchmen, we take the occasion offered us, to cast a glance upon the history and features of the Church, as it came from the hands of the apostles. We may expect to be asked whether we are prepared to assert any other system as truly apostolic, or whether there is any view of the Church which we can support, as more truly consistent with that originally instituted, than the one we are condemning? And here is our answer:—

First, negatively, we assert that the New Testament has abolished everything sacerdotal. It is true, of the temple system and service as of the temple itself, that there is not left remaining one stone upon another, from top-stone to foundation, that is not thrown down. Christianity has on earth, since that overthrow, no priesthood except that which every Christian claims, no sacrifices, no temple, no prescribed ritual. What has she then instead?

Again, positively, she has just what Christ and the apostles gave her,—neither more nor less; and what that is must be gathered from the history and the provisions of the New Testament. The apostles and prophets, God's early and provisional gift, having been removed, she still possesses elders, who, at times,

fulfil the office of evangelists, at times, of missionaries, at times, of bishops, overseers, or pastors. She has also deacons, who are God's gift for the serving of tables,—in other words, for the management of certain secular affairs; nor can we see in all the New Testament, traces of any higher office than these two, by which the Church is left to be both governed and served; abundant room being reserved for the services of all the membership, both male and female, who are willing to be helps, and to consecrate their efforts to promote her great ends.

And here, it may be asked, on what model or by what process was this arrangement framed? The apostles were not amateur inventors of governments or constitutions, nor were they verbally directed, as Moses was, in the framing of their system. We rather conjecture, in the absence of positive statements, and contemplating results, that they followed those good examples with which they were familiar, and to which they were providentially directed, and that, foremost among these, were the arrangements of the synagogue. In every considerable town and village they were accustomed to employ the synagogues, not only for worship, but for preaching; and, like other intelligent Jews, they were perfectly and habitually conversant with every peculiarity of the synagogue government. Nothing, indeed, is more familiar in the history of Paul, than the advantage he invariably took of the Jewish synagogues during his missionary tours, for addressing his countrymen, and even for reaching the ear of the Gentiles. Every specialty of place or circumstance, every abuse or misarrangement, every advantage or disadvantage of the system, were well known to him, and habitually present to his mind. On the whole, we may conclude that the synagogue presented to the apostle's wise and heaven-directed mind, many features worthy of imitation in the Christian economy, which, indeed, to his vigilant eye, was now taking shape. Forbidden, as he was, by fundamental principle, as well as direct instruction, to re-enact any system bearing the features of Jewish sacerdotalism, what more natural for him than to turn to the synagogue and to make it his study as a general model for the future government of the Christian Church?

The synagogues were everywhere governed by elders or rulers, one of whom, sometimes emphatically styled "the ruler," or "the bishop," occupied a special and more responsible place among them. He was the public speaker or preacher, and it fell to him ordinarily to address the assembled worshippers. At his pleasure he invited others to utter any word of exhortation to the people. In every synagogue certain seats were set apart as more honourable than the rest, which were coveted by ambitious persons, desirous of pre-eminence. These

were "the uppermost seats," and on one of these sat the chief-ruler, or presiding elder. But there were also seats appropriated to persons desirous of being invited to address the assembly. This explains the incidents in our Lord's life at Nazareth, and in that of the apostle at Antioch in Pisidia, where we are told of each that after he had sat down, he was invited to address the people. Besides these office-bearers, there were also deacons, for we may call them so, seeing that they were chiefly devoted to the care of the poor, and that the Hebrew names by which they were designated are translated into Greek by the words *Διάκονος* and *ἐπηρέτης*, rendered in our English Bibles, "deacon" and "minister." We need not enter into the controversy, in which Vitranga and Miller take a prominent part, relative to some peculiarities of the Jewish official thus designated, for it would not alter this conclusion; nor need we contend that the functions of the office in either case were absolutely identical, for of course they would be modified by the genius and the circumstances of the systems to which each of them belonged. It is enough to observe, that in both the office had to do with the "serving of tables," and that it was ministerial, not governmental, and in both subordinate to that of the eldership. Besides the elders and deacons, there were several inferior offices attached to the synagogue, whose functions were humbler, answering, probably, to those of our beadles and attendants, so that, for a complete staff of office-bearers no fewer than ten individuals were requisite, of whom four were elders, or rulers, one of these being known as the chief-ruler, or bishop, three deacons, and three of an inferior class. The authorities from which we draw these facts are Jewish, and among them Maimonides, a distinguished rabbi of the twelfth century, whose testimony on Jewish antiquities is generally trusted, and who gives his evidence without reference to Christian controversies.

From these sources, we learn several important facts regarding the form of synagogue worship in the days of the apostles. The Scriptures, which were honourably preserved in a prominent place of security, seen by all the worshippers, were ordinarily drawn forth with testimonies of the highest reverence, when about to be read to the people. Reading, praying, and preaching were the simple duties of the hour of assembly, and in the last of these exercises strangers were often invited to take part. So free was this privilege of public address, that the Apostle Paul seems seldom to have found any difficulty in using it for the preaching of the gospel.

No wonder, then, if he should have looked with a friendly eye upon these institutions, and should have been willing to adopt them, at least in so far as they were suited to the pur-

poses of the young Christian Church, preferring a general model, already familiar to the Jewish mind, to the framing of any novel system which might have been misunderstood and offensive. The ruling elders for government, with their presiding elder for preaching and similar sacred duties, the deacons for secular affairs, and such humbler functionaries as were obviously needed for material convenience, exactly suited the requirements of their rising system, while the simplicity of the public service, quite removed from anything sacerdotal or ritual, harmonised entirely with all that we read of the character of apostolic worship.

That this was the actual history of the earliest Christian system, may not be capable of actual proof, but it is rendered probable by several facts. The presiding elder, for example, was ordinarily known in the Christian Church, as he had been in the synagogue, by the name of "bishop or overseer." The Jewish elders and deacons were represented by similar office-bearers in the Christian Church, while the Christian assemblies were spoken of familiarly as synagogues. James, for example, in that passage where he blames the early Church for shewing partiality to a rich man with a gold ring entering their assembly, employs the Greek word *συναγωγή* (Jas. ii. 2), and Paul, when he warns his fellow-Christians not to forsake the assembling of themselves together, employs the word *ἐπισυναγωγή* (Heb. x. 25).

The customs of the synagogue became early familiar, in some striking respects, to Christians. Synagogue elders were set apart among the Jews by laying on of hands, in the council or sanhedrim, known not unfrequently as the presbytery, and in Christianity this was adopted by divine authority in the ordination of pastors. Even a certain subordination of courts seems to have existed in the Jewish synagogues, for Paul speaks of the whole estate of the elders under the title *παν το πρεσβυτέριον* (Acts xxii. 5), meaning, evidently, not the particular consistory of any one synagogue, but a recognised general council of all the elderships of the holy city. This was probably the ordaining body. It also claimed authority, as the rabbis tell us, over all foreign synagogues, and seems to have been the court to which the Roman Jews alluded, when they acknowledged to the Apostle Paul that no complaint against him had reached them from Jerusalem.

These remarks may perhaps be said to belong to the field of probabilities, rather than of certainties. And we will not deny that this is a field in which absolute certainties have been, by divine wisdom, withheld. But what we claim for the account now given, and claim with unhesitating confidence, is simply this, that it is agreeable to all the certainties we possess,

and far more consistent with the real state of affairs in apostolic times, than any other theories on which ritualistic prelacy has pretended to rely. It cannot be said of the synagogue, as it must be of the temple, that, by divine authority, it has been denounced and abolished. Long after sentence had gone forth against the temple, and its sacrifices and priesthood had lost the stamp of divine institution, the synagogue was frequented and employed by the apostles; and Christian synagogues, with their sanction, opened their gates for the gatherings of the people of God in every city, town, and village where they dwelt, but Christians had no temple nor temple worship. The service in these churches partook of the simple character with which all their synagogue associations had made them familiar. There were no changes of posture, no bowings or genuflexions, no incense offerings or sacrifices. Priests and priestly actions had been confined by the Jews to the temple, and Christians certainly did not introduce these into their synagogues. The apostles, accepting from their Master the abolition of the temple, never entertained the idea of being themselves priests. They called themselves ministers of Christ and of his people, elders of the Christian synagogue, bishops of the Church of Christ, but nowhere do we find a hint of their esteeming themselves priests. They were missionaries to preach and baptize, endowed with divine gifts and graces for this purpose, but they had nothing to do with sacrifice.

Compare the apostles with the Aaronic priesthood. Could any two things be more distinct? The latter belonged to the temple at Jerusalem. They were members of a particular tribe and family, and personally they were required to be free from all bodily defects. They were consecrated by a prescribed ceremonial, which lasted for seven days, and terminated with a sin-offering and a burnt-offering. While a priest's term of service lasted, he was rigorously confined to the holy place. A priest could not touch a dead body, nor shave off his hair, except by prescribed rule. In the most ordinary circumstances he had to submit to a constant pressure of regulations. His dress was peculiar; he had to subject himself to ceremonial washings, and must suit his vestments to the services he performed. It was his part to take charge, in his turn, of the holy places, and of the furniture of the temple, to burn the sacrifices, and pour out their blood, to put shew-bread on the table, to offer incense, to blow the silver trumpets, to trim and snuff the silver lamps, to pronounce a blessing on the people, and to act among them both as an instructor and a judge. The priests were maintained in quietude and ease, in their own cities, by public revenues, and when in actual service, they and their families partook of various temple perquisites.

Such were the priests. Could anything be easily imagined more unlike the apostles? Take the case of Paul. His descent was from the tribe of Benjamin. His person, if we may draw a conclusion from his own allusions, was probably deformed. His home was fixed in no locality. His duties were limited by no code of regulations. His services were those of preaching wherever a synagogue, a common school, or a hired lodging could be obtained, or wherever, under the canopy of heaven, men could be brought together within the sound of the gospel. He went forth to his arduous duties unfurnished with scrip or purse, without wardrobe and material means, a pensioner upon the kindness and affection of the people of God. Follow Paul where you will, shall you find one action of his partaking, at whatever distance, of a priestly character? When and where was his consecration? Where stood his temple? Describe his robes of office. What victims did he offer in sacrifice? What bowings, washings, incensings, or genuflexions did he perform? Does not the very naming of such things in connection with the Apostle Paul seem an incongruity, and provoke a smile? His whole example echoes the Saviour's sentence upon the temple,—“There shall not be left one stone upon another which shall not be thrown down.”

Were we to appeal to his writings, we might take up the Epistle to the Hebrews, where, demonstrating that neither temple nor earthly priesthood now exists, he reminds his readers that Christ having offered one sacrifice for sin as our only High Priest and Mediator, has passed into the heavens, that his sacrifice needs no repetition, and that with him the earthly priesthood ceased. These lessons he teaches, as if he foresaw that in degenerate latter days, professed Christians would return to the carnal elements of the law. It seems as if he would warn them against the doctrine to be afterwards so diligently preached, not alas, by Romish priests alone, of an unbloody sacrifice in the Lord's Supper needing an earthly priesthood to offer it,—a heresy which lies at the root of the whole priestly system. His doctrine is such as we might expect from one who wishes to guard us, by anticipation, against sacramentarian errors, and who speaks of baptism as we find in 1st Cor. i. 14–16, “I thank God I baptised none of you, but Crispus and Gaius; lest any should say I baptized in mine own name. And I baptized also the household of Stephanus, besides, I know not if I baptized any other.” As if he would say this was a point of which I made no note, and which was of no moment, for “Christ sent me not to baptize but to preach the gospel.” “Unto me,” he says again, “is this grace given, that I should preach among the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ.” We appeal to the apostle Paul, not because his authority is

more opposed to priestly assumption than that of other apostles. Peter (the first on the list of popes!), James, John, and Jude, are equally free from the slightest shadow of priestly doctrine, each of them accepting our Lord's statement in its full extent, and taking for granted throughout, that the temple, including, of course, its priesthood and ritual, is finally abolished. In vain shall they search the New Testament to find the slightest colour of plausibility for asserting divine authority in favour of the principles and practices of ritualism. How, then, can we but be amazed at the bold presumption of a party, neither small nor decreasing, in the Church of England, which dare openly to abjure the name and character of Protestants, and assert that under divine authority they are warranted to introduce a system which goes as far as the ancient legal economy would have done to neutralise the doctrines of the cross? It was an apostle who withstood the ritualists of the earliest age, and prevented their foisting the deadly error on the church, and we cannot esteem it a happy thing in the present temper of the times, that so many seem ready to repudiate his example, and that a disposition manifests itself when we might have expected more firmness and decision, to look with laxity and indifference, if not with favour, on the progress of sensual worship and priestly assumption.

Let Protestants, whether of the Established or Non-Conformist churches, beware of this. They may fall ere they are aware, into the extreme danger of "wondering after the beast." What have Protestants to do with ritualism, except to condemn and resist it? Has not the temple long since been levelled by God's sentence with the dust, its altar overthrown, its priesthood degraded and scattered? and have not its divine privileges been finally withdrawn? Are not the very foundations of the ancient sanctuary strewn as if in contempt beneath a mosque of the false prophet? Have not its gorgeous decorations, its costly offerings, its elaborate ceremonial, its robed and consecrated priesthood, been from the first, by apostolic precept and example, carefully excluded from our Christian system? What, then, have we to do with these? What is it to us that the Jews had a sumptuous worship, that their temple was splendid with gold and jewels, and that stoled priests offered the prescribed sacrifices with all the splendour of the Mosaic ritual? God has given us a better mode of worship. Our Master points us to the heavenly temple, whither himself, our Great High Priest, has gone. He prescribes to us no sacrificial offerings, but he directs our eye of faith to the one sacrifice of Calvary. He demands no decorations, or vestments, or incense, to render our worship more acceptable. But he desires the ornament of a holy life, the clothing of Christ's

righteousness, and the incense of believing prayer in all his people. Let the Christian then be content with an unadorned worship. Let him go down with the apostles and be a worshipper with them in the Christian synagogue, simple in all its appointments, and giving the chief place to the Word of God as its only essential ornament. Let him desire no affectation of sacerdotal service, of altar sacrifice, with its smoking incense and splendid ceremonial, for the Christian holds of the synagogue, not the temple, where he can enjoy a spiritual worship, and where he hears the simple preaching of Christ crucified, to the Jews a stumbling block, and the Greeks foolishness, but to them who are saved, Christ, the power of God, and the wisdom of God.

G. J. C. D.

ART. IV.—*The Topography of Ancient Jerusalem, as Illustrated by Recent Exploration.*

The City of the Great King ; or, Jerusalem as it Was, as it Is, and as it is to Be. By J. T. BARCLAY, M.D. Philadelphia. 1858.

Jerusalem Revisited. By W. H. BARTLETT, Author of "Walks about Jerusalem." London : T. Nelson & Sons, Edinburgh and New York.

Jerusalem Explored : being a Description of the Ancient and Modern City, with numerous Illustrations, consisting of Views, Ground Plans, and Sections. By ERMETTE PIEROTTI, Architect and Engineer, Civil and Military, to His Excellency Surayah Pasha, Jerusalem. Translated by Bonney. London : Bell & Daldy.

Horeb and Jerusalem. By the Rev. GEORGE SANDIE. Edinburgh : Edmonston & Douglas.

Progress-Reports, and Sectional Drawings of the Palestine Exploration Society.

IT has been often said of Jerusalem, that the remains of its ancient grandeur lie, like a fossil in its deep bed, beneath some forty or fifty feet of rubbish ; and that the pickaxe and spade, handled under judicious and scientific direction, would do far more than the pen to solve a multitude of intricate topographical problems, which have long puzzled and divided the learned.

This saying is at the present time receiving remarkable confirmation. The Palestine Exploration Society, having obtained the sanction of the authorities at Constantinople, and the valuable co-operation of local officials, have, for the last few months, directed their investigations specially to the Holy City ; and by means of the skilful and energetic labours of their agents,—Lieut. Warren, and his assistants—very interest-

ing results have already been obtained, by which Scripture facts are usefully illustrated, and the most striking corroboration is given to the testimony of the Jewish historian, Josephus. It is found that in some places the explorer must go down through *debris* one hundred feet in depth in order to reach the original surface. With what solemn emphasis does such an enormous accumulation—the rubbish of thirty centuries—speak of the walls and dwelling-places, the fortresses and palaces of Jerusalem having been laid waste ! and what a proof is it of the terrible execution of the threatening once uttered against the capital of the chosen people,—“I will make Jerusalem heaps”!

We are persuaded that we do not miscalculate the feeling of our readers, when we suppose that they will be ready to accompany us in the examination of some points of Jerusalem topography, with the aid of such new light as is being offered us in the results of this recent movement.

Does the Jerusalem of the present day contain vestiges of the city of Herod or of Solomon ? Have any remains of the Jewish capital, as it stood at either or both of these epochs, come down to our time, in spite of the many desolating changes which it has undergone, some of which threatened its utter annihilation ? This is an inquiry which interests every thoughtful man ; and there are few who are not alive to the importance of discoveries which have conclusively established the affirmative reply to it. Our present object will be to shew what is known respecting some of the more interesting antiquities of the Holy City ; more especially the relics of the temple and other notable structures ; the extent and divisions of ancient Jerusalem ; also, its very remarkable water supply ; and to indicate, as we proceed, how far recent exploration has added to our stock of information on this important subject. There is another topic, much canvassed of late, on which, although but indirectly touched upon by the latest explorers, we shall, ere we close, offer a few observations,—we mean the question of the site of the Holy Sepulchre.

When one, with Josephus in his hand, examines the wall of the Haram Es-Shereef, he finds it impossible to doubt that it occupies, in part at least, the site of the Temple of Solomon, and the more careful his observations, the more thorough and earnest his inquiries, the stronger does his conviction become that in part of the enclosure, and in the substructions of the Haram platform, there are to be seen veritable relics of that ancient edifice. It was in establishing this, among other points in the archæology of Jerusalem and Palestine, that Dr Robinson achieved for himself the distinguished place, which, by common consent, he holds, and will ever hold, among writers on sacred topography. We do not in every case accept his conclusions,

for in some instances he has been proved to have been mistaken in his premises, or incorrect in the deductions which he drew from them. But we only award a meed which is richly merited, when we say, that in respect of accurate scholarship, well applied learning, profound sagacity, shrewd and careful observation, indefatigable industry, enthusiasm united to patient inquiry, freedom from prejudice and pretentiousness, honest love of truth, and thorough trustworthiness as a witness in the intricate questions which he handled, it is hardly possible to overrate Dr Robinson's merits. And in no part of his magnificent and invaluable work, which marks an epoch in this department of literature, do his pre-eminent qualifications for the task which he undertook more fully appear, than in the investigation of this particular question. That he was the first to break ground in the thorough investigation of it, he himself distinctly states, and the fact should not be forgotten. "How far there exist traces," he says, "which may serve to mark a connection between the ancient and modern precincts—the Temple and the Haram—and perhaps establish their identity, is a point which, so far as I know, has never been discussed."*

The huge size of the blocks, which appear in portions of the lower part of the wall, convinces even a casual observer, that they must be referred to an earlier date than the upper part, which is obviously of modern origin. The appearance of the wall, in every part which is accessible, indicates that it has been built on ancient foundations; as if the original wall, of singularly massive blocks, had been thrown down, and a new one had been raised in later times on the remains of the old. At the S.E. corner, there are fifteen courses of this ancient masonry. In some of the courses, both of the eastern and the southern wall, the stones measure from 17 to 19 feet in length by 3 or 4 feet in height; while one block at the S.E. corner is $7\frac{1}{2}$ feet thick, and one at the N.E. corner of the Haram is 24 feet in length. One of the stones at the S.W. corner measures 30 feet 10 inches by 6 feet 6 inches, and others vary from $20\frac{1}{2}$ to $24\frac{1}{2}$ feet long by 5 feet in thickness. We can well understand how, as our Lord on one occasion went out of the temple, one of the disciples should say to him—"Master, see what manner of stones and what buildings are these!" Of all this, a glance at Mr Tipping's admirable plates, contained in Traill's *Josephus*, or Signor Pierotti's lithographs of the tower at the N.E. corner of the Haram, or the admirable photographs of these points, issued by the Exploration Society,

* "Researches," vol. ii. (ed. 1841) p. 418.

will satisfy the candid student, without a trip to Jerusalem, or a personal inspection of the wall.

These stones are, according to the usual phrase, *bevelled*—(the more correct technical expression is *rebated*)—which means, that after the face of the stone was hewn and squared, a draft of two inches or more in breadth was cut down along the edges lower than the rest of the surface. When these rebated stones are joined together in a wall, its face exhibits lines or grooves formed by these drafts, or depressed edges, at their junction, marking more distinctly the height of the different courses, as well as the length of each stone. This is known to have been the style of masonry practised among the ancient Phenicians, having been found in portions of the walls of ancient Tyre, and in other architectural remains of old Phenicia. From the connection that there was between Hiram and both David and Solomon, it is not difficult to perceive how the Tyrian style of architecture would be imported into Jerusalem by the Phenician builders. It is self-evident, that these Cyclopean stones in the Haram wall were never laid in their places by Mohammedans, and that the style of the masonry is neither Roman nor Saracenic. That it speaks of a Jewish origin is beyond question.

This evidence is strikingly confirmed by the remains of the massive arch near the S.W. corner of the Haram area, which Dr Robinson was the first to identify as a relic of the bridge which once sprung from the western wall of the temple across the valley of the Tyropœon, and which Josephus repeatedly mentions as connecting the western side of the temple with the upper part of the city and with the Xystus. Occupying, as these stones do, their original position, they prove that the wall out of which they sprung is coeval with the formation of the bridge. This was in all probability part of the “ascent” from the king’s house to the house of the Lord on Moriah, which was constructed by Solomon’s builders, and which so greatly astonished the queen of Sheba, that after she beheld it, “there was no more spirit in her.”

Messrs Bonomi and Catherwood remarked these stones five years before Dr Robinson’s visit to Jerusalem, and perceived them to be part of a massive arch. They regarded them, too, as probably among the most ancient remains in or around Jerusalem, but, like many others who had seen them, had no suspicion of their historical import.

The engineering of the Palestine Exploration Expedition has also led to the discovery of an entire arch, of the same span (within a few inches) as Dr Robinson’s, which abuts on the western wall of the Haram, beneath the Mekhemeh (or Mohammedan tribunal), and near the Bâb-es-Silsileh. At the time

when we write, the details of this important discovery have not reached us. But there cannot be a doubt that it will shed an interesting light on the account given by the Jewish historian of the four gates which led from the western enclosure of the temple,—one to the king's palace over the intermediate valley, two to the suburbs of the city (probably the northern suburb Bezetha, and the suburb Ophel), and the last to the other city (Zion), where the road descended into the valley by a great number of steps, and thence up again by the ascent. The operations of Lieutenant Warren have, besides, disclosed very important facts relative to this portion of the antiquities of the holy city. By sinking a shaft near the south wall, he found that the mass of earth and rubbish lying on the rock at the S.E. corner of the Haram wall is not less than 60 feet in depth; so that the present surface is 60 feet higher at this spot than the rock on which the foundation of the wall rests, and which was no doubt the original surface. The fact has thus been ascertained, that the Haram wall at this corner is 138 feet high. The true bed of the Kedron valley is probably not less than 200 feet below the base of the wall. According to Josephus, the height of the middle portico above the wall was 100 feet. Assuming, therefore, that the ancient wall rose to a point not lower than the top line of the present wall (and it may have risen much higher), it appears that the distance from the summit of the middle portico, or "pinnacle," to the bed of the Kedron right below (for the rock at this point shelved down suddenly at an angle of rather more than 30 degrees), was 438 feet. Josephus says, that "the lowest part of the wall was 300 cubits," or, reckoning the cubit at 18 inches, 450 feet. He seems to refer to the height as measured from the bottom of the subjacent ravine; for he expressly says,—“Inasmuch as the valley was very deep, and its bottom could not be seen, if any one looked down from the top of the battlements he would be giddy,” etc.* We now find, that a statement which was wont to be regarded as a hyperbolical exaggeration of the Jewish historian, is the unvarnished truth, or a very close approximation to it.

The material of which the immense mass of rubbish accumulated here consists, is exactly such as might be expected, when we take into account the changes which have befallen Jerusalem through its chequered history. Masses of wrought stone, the loose *debris* of masonry, occasional pieces of marble, and enormous quantities of chippings, which, when disturbed by sinking a shaft, or driving a gallery through them, run like dry shingle, or, as Mr Warren expresses it, "like water,"—

* Antiq., Book xv. chap. ii. 5.

these were found to form the substratum after cutting through the superficial coat of soil. Such materials relate a history of successive dilapidations and reconstructions, in striking agreement with what we know, from other sources, to have been the fact with reference to Jerusalem, more, perhaps, than any other ancient city on the face of the earth, for often has it been "built again upon its own heap."*

At the commencement of his operations, Lieutenant Warren proceeded to bare the south wall in two places,—at the S.E. angle for 20 feet in depth, and between the triple gate and the gate of Huldah for 16 feet. In both places he found the stones, to that depth, similar in every way to those at the Jews' walling place. This work was suddenly stopped by the pacha, as being carried on too near the sacred area of the Haram. Bent, however, on ascertaining what sort of foundation the wall rests on, he sunk another shaft at the distance of 40 feet from the south wall, and drove a gallery up to it. At the distance of 15 feet from the south wall he encountered another wall running parallel to it, four feet in thickness. As it is composed of large and hard stones, great difficulty was experienced in mining through it. On striking the Haram wall at this depth, the course of stones on a level with the gallery was found to be four and a half feet in height, and rebated. A shaft was then sunk at the end of the gallery. The next lower course of stones was found to be of the same dimensions with that above, with a draft at top and bottom, and the centre bulging out undressed. The next course, which proved to be the bottom one, rested on the rock, which was partially levelled for the bed of the foundation.

Near the S.W. corner (40 feet eastward from it) Mr Warren proceeded in a similar manner, only sinking his shaft nearer the wall. He found the wall here to be not less than the enormous depth of 85 feet below the surface, and to be composed of stones exactly resembling, in every particular, those at the S.E. angle, being rebated to the foundation. As the rock descends from this point westwards, the wall is not less than 100 feet below the surface at the corner; so that, taking the height of the wall above ground at 85 feet, the entire wall is upwards of 185 feet high! The ancient Israelites, looking up to the temple cloisters from the bed of the Tyropœon, gazed on a structure of massive masonry unequalled in modern times, rising 285 feet from its base! Might they not exclaim, as they thought of this magnificent pile,—“Walk about Zion, and go round about her: tell the towers thereof.

* Jer. xxx.

Mark ye well her bulwarks, consider her palaces : that ye may tell it to the generation following”?

The following passage from the Lieutenant's progress-report gives a graphic account of the operation of sinking this shaft, and enables us, at the same time, to form some idea of the extremely perilous nature of the enterprise, and of the combined prudence, courage, and energy which are indispensable in the prosecution of it :—

“ On Friday, having arrived at a depth of 79 feet, the men were breaking up a stone at the bottom of the shaft. Suddenly, the ground gave way, down went the stone and the hammers, the men barely saving themselves. They at once rushed up and told the serjeant *they had found the bottomless pit!* I went down to the spot and examined it, and in order that you may have an idea of the extent of our work, I will give a description of our descent.

“ The shaft-mouth is on the south side of the Haram wall, near the south-west angle, among the prickly pears. Beside it, to the east, lying against the Haram wall, is a large mass of rubbish that has been brought up, whilst over the mouth itself is a triangular gin, with iron wheel attached, with guy for running up the excavated soil. Looking down the shaft, one sees that it is lined for the first 20 feet with frames, of 4 feet 6 inches in the clear. Further down, the Haram wall and soil cut through are seen, and a man standing at what appears to be the bottom. An order is given to this man, who repeats it, and then, faintly, is heard a sepulchral voice, answering, as it were, from another world. Reaching down to the man who is visible, is a 34 feet rope-ladder, and, on descending by it, one finds he is standing on a ledge which the ladder does not touch by four feet. This ledge is the top of a wall running north and south, and abutting on the Haram wall. Its east face just cuts the centre of the shaft, which has to be canted off about two feet towards the east, just where some large loose stones jut out in the most disagreeable manner. Here five more frames have been fixed to keep these stones steady. On peering down from this ledge, one sees the Haram wall, with its projecting courses, until they are lost in the darkness below, observing, also, at the same time, that two sides of the shaft are cut through the soil, and are self-supporting. Now, to descend this second drop, the ladder is again required. Accordingly, having told the man at the bottom to get under cover, it is lowered to the ledge, from whence it is found that it does not reach to the bottom by several feet. It is therefore lowered the required distance, and one has to reach it by climbing down, hand over hand, for about twelve feet. On passing along, one notes the marvellous joints of the Haram wall stones, and also, probably, gets a few blows on the skull and knuckles from falling pebbles. Just on reaching the bottom, one recollects there is still a pit of unknown depth to be explored, and cautiously straddles across it. Then can be seen that one course in the Haram wall, near the bottom, is quite smooth all over, the stone being finely dressed, all other courses being only half-dressed round the drafts. One also sees two stout

boards lying against the Haram wall, under which the men retire whenever an accidental shower of stones renders their position dangerous. One is now at a depth of 79 feet from the surface, and from here we commence the exploring of the 'bottomless pit.' After dropping a rope down, we found that it was only six feet deep, though it looked black enough for anything. Climbing down, we found ourselves in a passage running south from the Haram area, four feet high by two feet wide, and we explored this passage. It is rough rubble masonry, with flat stones at top, similar to the aqueduct from triple gate, but not so carefully constructed. The floor and sides are very muddy, as if water gathers there during the rainy season.

"It at once struck me that it was one of the overflow aqueducts from the temple of Solomon, and that there might be a water-conduit underneath. We scrambled along for a long way on our feet, our skulls and spines coming in unhappy contact with the passage roof. After about 200 feet, we found that the mud reached higher up, and we had to crawl by means of elbows and toes. Gradually the passage got more and more filled up, and our bodies could barely squeeze through, and there did not appear sufficient air to support us for any length of time, so that, having advanced 400 feet, we commenced a difficult retrograde movement, having to get back half-way before we could turn our heads round. On arriving at the mouth of the passage underneath the shaft, we spent some time in examining the sides, but there is no appearance of its having come under the Haram wall. It seems to start suddenly, and I can only suppose it to have been the examining-passage over an aqueduct coming from the temple, and I am having the floor taken up to settle the question. This passage is on a level with the foundations of the Haram wall, which are rough hewn stones,—perhaps rock,—I cannot tell yet. The bottom is the enormous distance of 85 feet below the surface of the ground, and as far as I can see as yet, *the wall at the south-west angle must be buried for 95 feet underground, so that it must have at one time risen to the height of 180 feet above the Tyropæon Gully.*"

The enormous mass of superincumbent rubbish through which this shaft was carried, told a similar tale to that at the S.E. corner. Here, however, a pavement was found at the depth of $12\frac{1}{2}$ feet, smooth, and well polished from wear, which must have anciently served for a footway around the wall. Beneath this were bricks, mortar, the *debris* of masonry, wrought stones of large size, and shingle. Most of the courses which were laid bare, at this part of the wall, were similar to those at the wailing place. The lower courses, however, differ from many seen above ground. "The faces of the stones appear as when they were brought from the quarries, roughly dressed into three faces, and projecting, in some cases, 18 inches beyond their drafts, which are about four to six inches wide, and most beautifully worked. The stones are fitted together in the most marvellous manner, the joints being hardly discernible."

In the valley of the Tyropœon, opposite to "Robinson's Arch," the results obtained are extremely interesting, though in some respects different from what many anticipated. It has usually been expected that excavation here would lay bare the remains of several piers and arches of the bridge, corresponding to the fragment still visible, now called "Robinson's Arch." The fragment of another pier has been found, 12 feet 2 inches thick, its east side distant 41 feet 6 inches from the wall of the Haram. Beyond this pier eastward is a pavement *in situ*, which has been traced for 8 feet, thus reducing the deep part of the gully to a width of 34 feet. Among the *debris*, large stones were found of three and four tons; and paving-stones of hard mezzeh, weighing between two and three tons. Fragments of other small piers were discovered westward of the large pier, which seem to have supported a succession of arches of comparatively narrow span, above which must have lain the famous "ascent" from Zion to the temple, the deep ravine of the Tyropœon alone being spanned by the bridge, whose eastern pier abutted on the temple wall. The theory respecting this structure (called the "ascent"), which is suggested by these results, is that the valley may have been crossed by a pavement or roadway supported on a colonnade (which may possibly have formed a southern termination of the Xystus), the deep gorge of the valley being spanned by the single massive arch; and on this bridge, there may, perhaps, have rested an imposing flight of steps leading upwards to the gate of the western cloister of the temple.

It may here be stated that northwards of the wailing place, as far as the Bab-es-Silsileh, or gate of the chain, the west wall is found to be similar in its character. The lower courses of the masonry, down to the foundation of rock, upwards of fifty feet below the surface, are found to be the same in style as those of the south wall,—indicating, therefore, the same antiquity. To the north of this point the wall is inaccessible, and nothing is known of it.

The massive and noble substructures of the Haram platform, point not less clearly than the style of the mural masonry, to a Solomonic origin. They have accordingly convinced even the most sceptical that we have here veritable remains of the work of the builders of the son of David, or, at the latest, of his immediate successors. Let us advert for a few moments to the information, now of some standing, respecting these remarkable works, for which we are mainly indebted to Bonomi, Catherwood, and Tipping; and then inquire what additions have been made to our knowledge in this intensely interesting department of the antiquities of Jerusalem, by the bold and ingenious operations of Lieutenant Warren.

The readers of Traill's *Josephus* are familiar with the graphic narrative in which Mr Tipping describes the circumstances that led to his somewhat adventurous examinations of the passage to which the gate of Huldah, now closed, was the entrance. And they are not less familiar with the beautiful plates contained in that work, which illustrate the architecture of this ancient and noble gateway. Near the middle of the south wall, and at the point where the city-wall strikes off from it at a right-angle, there is a ruinous Moslem excrescence, which almost wholly conceals this gateway—usually called Huldah's gate—above which is visible part of an entablature, stuck on long ago for decoration's sake, but which is obviously to be referred to a later era than the wall itself, or the entrance. Mr Tipping having clandestinely entered through a gap in the wall of this ruin, found a double gateway opening into a quadrangular entrance-hall, 60 feet by 42, beyond which is a passage or arcade, which runs beneath the entire length of the Mosque El Aksa. The roof of the entrance hall consists of four dome-shaped and groined vaults, which are supported by a central monolith of limestone, with a capital bearing some traces of a palm-leaf ornament, but not belonging to any of the classic orders of architecture. From this hall there originally sprung (for one is now walled up) two sets of steps leading up to a long passage, divided by a row of square columns of three or four stones each, corresponding to the division of the door-way and the position of the monolith pillar. The style and character of the whole are very similar to the golden gate, except that they unquestionably point to an earlier era. At the north end of the vault, which is about seven feet below the Haram level, there is a modern gate opening by a flight of steps into the enclosure of the mosque above. There cannot be a doubt that this is the ancient temple-gate mentioned by Josephus, when he says, "The fourth front of the temple, which was southward, had indeed itself gates in the middle."* Lieut. Warren has ascertained that there are no substructures *westward* of this passage, which he believes to be a tunnel built through forced earth, and unconnected with vaults on either side.

There are other extensive vaults which support the level of the Haram platform, at its south-east corner. The entrance to these is by a small subterranean mosque. Extending westward from the eastern wall, as far as "the triple gate," a distance of about 320 feet, there are fifteen rows of square piers, from which spring arches supporting the Haram platform. The spaces between the ranges of arches are irregular. It is necessary to advert here to the upward inclination of the ground

* Josephus Ant., xv. ii. 5.


in a curved line, west and north, until the ridge is reached, about the middle of the south wall, where the rock was probably cut away in part. From this point westward, it bends down to the deep gully of the Tyropœon. The subjoined diagram will illustrate this and subsequent references. Owing to the rapid rise of the ground towards the north and west, the arches vary in height as well as width, the southern arches being about thirty-five feet in height, while the northern are only ten. It is a curious fact, that in some instances the roots of the olive trees, which adorn the platform above, have penetrated through the arches, and, still descending, have again taken root in the soil of the crypt, which is also a favourite haunt of owls and ravens. It is probable that where the arches terminate, the rock nearly rises to the level of the platform. At the triple gate, the floor within, being the native rock, is on a level with the exterior surface of the ground, while, at the south-east angle, the outer surface is many feet below. The stones of the piers are five feet long, and bevelled at the ends and corners. These substructions are of admirable workmanship; possess, in a pre-eminent degree, all the peculiar features of Jewish architecture; and are, without question, of the highest antiquity.

Lieutenant Warren found that the bases of the piers of these vaults, rest on a plane which is 17 feet above the exterior surface of the earth at the south-east angle, and 80 feet above the rock. Thinking it very unlikely that all this space would be filled with forced earth, he concluded that there might be another system of old arches beneath these already known. He accordingly, with characteristic vigour, set about determining this question; and after repeated and unsuccessful attempts, he discovered an entrance through the south temple wall, which leads to a passage running 60 feet northwards. It is from 12 to 18 feet in height; its roof is 20 feet below the surface of the floor of the haram vaults, and 60 feet below the level of the platform. The walls are composed of strong masonry, some of the stones being 15 feet long, nearly all bevelled, and beautifully worked; the upper course four feet in height; the roof consisting of large stones, many of them bevelled, and laid flat on the upper course of the walls. Along the bottom of the passage, on either side, there are remains of a small aqueduct, made of dark cement. The use of this passage is, as yet, unknown.

Let us now place these facts alongside of the description which Josephus gives of the temple, and observe how the facts and the history tally.

“ There was a large wall to both the cloisters, which wall was itself the most prodigious work that was ever heard of by man. The hill

SECTIONAL ELEVATION OF THE SOUTH WALL OF HARAM AREA.



was a rocky ascent, that declined by degrees towards the east parts of the city, till it came to an elevated level. This hill it was which Solomon . . . encompassed with a wall. It was of excellent workmanship, upwards and round the top of it. . . . At the south side he laid rocks together, . . . and included some of the inner parts, till it proceeded to a great height, and till both the largeness of the square edifice and its altitude were immense, and till the vastness of the stones in the front was plainly visible on the outside; yet so that the inward parts were fastened together with iron, and preserved the joints immoveable for all future time. . . . Now in the western quarters of the enclosure of the temple there were four gates; the first led to the king's palace, and went to a passage over the intermediate valley; two more led to the suburbs of the city; and the last led to the other city, where the road descended down into the valley by a great number of steps, and thence up again by the ascent, for the city lay over against the temple in the manner of a theatre, and was encompassed with a deep valley along the entire south quarter. But the fourth front of the temple, which was southward, had indeed itself gates in its middle, as also it had the royal cloisters, with three walks, which reached in length from the east valley unto that on the west, for it was impossible that it should reach any farther, and this cloister deserves to be mentioned better than any other under the sun; for while the valley was very deep, and its bottom could not be seen if you looked from above into the depth, this farther vastly high elevation of the cloister stood upon that height, insomuch that if any one looked down from the top of the battlements, or down both these altitudes, he would be giddy, while his sight could not reach to such an immense height."—*Antiq.*, b. xv., ch. ii., sec. 5.

These huge remains of ancient masonry which we have described,—the Cyclopean fragments of the arch which spanned the Tyropœon—the southern gateway and entrance gallery—the massive substructures,—all point to the highest antiquity, and prove that the present southern wall, and the south part of the platform of the Haram, occupy the site of, and are identical with, the south side of the area of Solomon's temple. As for the objection that the arch is Roman, and that the ancient Jews were not acquainted with it, the masonry which lies beneath the Pools of Solomon overthrows this theory; while the discoveries at Nineveh prove that the arch was known in the East long before Rome was founded. Nor can these relics of ancient Jerusalem be Herodian; for, except in constructing a subterranean passage to it from the tower of Antonia, Herod did not interfere with the foundations of the temple. He only rebuilt the *naos*, or sanctuary, and erected the cloisters which surmounted its walls.

The difficulty presented by the statement of Josephus regarding the length of the southern wall is not insurmountable. According to him the temple enclosure was a quadrangle, mea-

suring four stadia in circumference, or a stadium on each side—the stadium being usually considered equal to about 607 of our feet. In another place he gives the circumference, including the tower of Antonia, at six stadia. Not to speak of the impossibility of attaining certainty as to the precise value of the measures used by Josephus,—for here authorities have been greatly divided,—it may at once be conceded, that there is not a little confusion, and sometimes exaggeration, in some of his statements regarding the temple. In this instance, his error consists in understating the fact by about 300 feet. Dr Robinson puts the case with judicial fairness, when he says :—

“ Josephus wrote at Rome, far from his native land, and long after the destruction of Jerusalem ; nor is there any evidence or probability that he had collected specific materials for his works in his own country previously to that event. Hence, when he enters into minute descriptions, and professes to give the exact details of heights and magnitudes, there is every reason to distrust the accuracy of his assertions, except perhaps, in things of public notoriety,—such, for example, as the distances between places situated on the great roads. But in cases where he describes in specific terms the length and breadth and height of buildings, or the like,—measures which he himself had certainly never taken, and which were not likely to be publicly known,—we can regard these only as matters of estimate or conjecture, on the part of an author writing far remote from the objects described.”—*Res. i.*, 414.

There is considerable difficulty in determining how far the Temple area extended northwards. It is generally held that the masonry at the Golden Gate, about 1018 feet from the south corner of the Eastern wall, is neither Solomonic nor Herodian, even in the lowest courses of the wall. Dr Robinson speaks of it as “ Roman work.” By some it is referred to a period not earlier than the time of Adrian or Justinian. To the north of this gate “ the whole appearance of the wall is that of a structure which was built of former materials, irregularly thrown together.” But at the N.E. corner of the Haram wall, the ancient Jewish masonry indubitably reappears for a distance of upwards of 80 feet. The stones are of large dimensions up to a considerable height in the wall. One of them measures 23 ft. 9 in. by 3 ft. 5 in., and similar stones are carried round the corner in the north wall of the Haram, within the city. These are certainly the remains of an ancient bastion ; no other, doubtless, than the bastion of the tower at the S.E. corner of Antonia, which, as Josephus states, commanded a view of the entire temple.

We do not enter into the arguments, partly historical, partly topographical, by which Dr Robinson has satisfactorily proved

that the Fortress of Antonia stood at the N.W. corner of the Haram area, occupying in part the site of the present Serai, or barrack, and extending from west to east throughout the entire width of the enclosure; and that the deep trench (now called by some the Pool of Bethesda), is a portion of the fosse which protected the fortress on its northern side. On these points we accept his conclusions, which few have challenged, and no one has succeeded in subverting. The only particular here in which we are obliged to suggest a modification of the views of the distinguished author of the "Researches," has reference to the space which intervened between Antonia and the temple. He holds that this intervening space formed part of the fortress, properly so called, and in some sort connected it with the Temple. Now, it seems to us to be clear, from various considerations, that this space must have been a deep depression or ditch.

According to Josephus, the castle of Antonia was joined to the cloisters of the temple, *only at the N.W. angle*; but the history of the Roman siege shows that this connection could be cut off. The rock on which the castle was erected rose to the height of 75 feet. The fortress itself was 60 feet in height, so that its summit must have been toward 135 feet above its rocky base. He states expressly that "it was a great precipice," and that it was separated from Bezetha on the north by a deep artificial trench, the depth of which added greatly to the elevation of the tower. It was of large dimensions, containing numerous apartments and courts, and roomy spaces for the accommodation of soldiery. On each of the four corners there was a lofty tower. That which rose at the S.E. corner was 105 feet in height, and commanded a view of the entire temple. At the S.W. corner, where it was connected by some sort of gallery, or colonnade, with the cloisters, there were passages by which the guards had access to the cloisters on the Jewish festivals, to keep watch over the populace, and repress any attempt at disorder. This is the amount of the direct information which Josephus gives us respecting Antonia. We gather from it, that the fortress must have stood apart, and that it was precipitous on all sides, implying great depression of the ground beneath. Now, the fosse, or trench, lying to the north, of whose prodigious depth Josephus repeatedly makes mention, and part of which is still extant, proves its isolation on that side. Eastward, the lofty tower overhung the deep valley of the Kedron. On the south, it is plain that a deep moat or ditch also separated the citadel from the temple. This appears from what Josephus states in connection with the siege of Pompey: "Even on the north side of the temple there were great towers, *and a ditch had been dug, and a deep valley begirt it round*

about, for on the parts towards the city are precipices," &c. * Besides, the incidents of the siege under Titus show distinctly that the northern wall of the temple must have been separated from Antonia by a trench of considerable depth, so that the temple wall could only be approached by means of the formation of mounds with immense labour. Referring to the operations which were carried on against the northern wall from the fortress, Josephus says :—

" Titus again commenced raising mounds, though materials were now procured with difficulty ; for all the trees around the city having been felled for the preceding works, the troops had to collect timber from a distance of 90 furlongs, and to raise mounds much larger than the former, at four points opposite the Antonia alone."—*Wars*, v. 12, sec. 4.

Again, describing a later stage of the operations, Josephus says :—

" In the meantime, the remainder of the Roman force having in seven days overturned the foundation of Antonia, had prepared a wide ascent as far as the temple. The legions now approached the first wall, and commenced their mounds—one opposite the north-west angle of the inner temple, a second at the northern chamber which was between the two gates, and, of the remaining two, one at the western colonnade of the outer court of the temple, the other without at the northern."—*Wars*, vi. 2, sec. 7.

From all this it is clear, not only that the possession of Antonia did not make Titus master of the temple, but that the space between the fortress and the northern wall of the Temple, and the strength of that wall, were such as to render the erection of mounds of earth at great labour indispensable as a preparation for the assault. The existence of a deep ravine or fosse here, satisfactorily explains the necessity ; and Lieutenant Warren's excavations manifestly tend to confirm this view of the case. He says :—" There is a point somewhat north of the mosque of Omar platform where there may probably have been a deep ditch, now filled with earth ; if not, it must be a natural valley, as the rock is entirely wanting at the surface."

What would be the width of this ditch or valley ? If we hold the temple to have been, according to the statements of Josephus and the Talmud, an exact square, its north wall would nearly coincide with the north end of the marble platform of the " Dome of the Rock," to be afterwards described. But let us suppose that the Golden gate marks the probable position of the tower or bastion which stood at the north-east corner of the temple, so that a line drawn across the Haram area from

* *Antiq.*, xiii. 4, sec. 2.

east to west, along the north face of that gate, will mark the line of the north wall of the ancient temple (thus making the quadrangle oblong, though it might still be popularly called "a square"), there will be, according to Pierotti's elaborate ground-plan of the Haram, a distance of about 500 feet between that line and the south edge of the fosse or Birket Israil. Allowing 150 feet for the width of the fortress at its east end, the moat or ditch dividing it from the temple would be 350 feet. The importance of this conclusion will be seen in its bearing on an interesting question to be afterwards adverted to.

Having identified the site of the temple, and that of the fortress of Antonia, we proceed to inquire if there be any other ancient landmarks extant which will enable us to determine, with something like certainty, the limits of the city as it stood in the time of the first Herod, or even at an earlier epoch.

Here we at once direct attention to the tower of HIPPICUS, —a landmark of prime importance in settling the topography of ancient Jerusalem, as described by Josephus. Of this tower, the historian has given a pretty minute description. It was erected by the first Herod, in memory of a dear friend who fell in battle, while he was courageously fighting. It stood over against Psephinus at the north-west corner of the upper city. It was square in form, each side being 25 cubits, and, to the height of 30 cubits, it was built a solid mass of masonry. Over this solid building, which was composed of great stones united together, there was a reservoir, 20 cubits deep, above which there stood a house of two stories, whose height was 25 cubits, containing several chambers. The whole was surmounted with battlements of 2 cubits, and turrets of 3 cubits high, so that the entire height amounted to 80 cubits, or 120 feet. Josephus speaks of this and other two memorial towers (Phasaelus and Mariamne) which stood near it, in glowing terms, as of unexampled beauty and strength: "because, in addition to the magnanimity of Herod's nature, and his munificence towards the city on other occasions, he built these after such an extraordinary manner to gratify his own private affections." * Let it be remembered that, from the circumstances in which Josephus wrote, it is highly improbable that he had exact measurements of this tower in his possession, and that, for this reason, as was formerly remarked, strict accuracy in these details, which must have been given conjecturally, or simply as rough guesses, is not to be expected. On the other hand, the circumstance that a portion of this tower was solid, was one likely to be publicly known, and one in which there was hardly room for

* Wars, v. 4, sec. 3.

mis-statement by a truthful historian. Now we know from the express testimony of Josephus * that this tower was spared by Titus, along with so much of the wall as enclosed the city on the west side. "This wall was spared in order to afford an encampment for such as were to lie there in garrison; the towers were spared, in order to demonstrate to posterity what kind of city it was, and how well fortified, which the Roman valour had subdued; but as to all the rest of the wall, it was so thoroughly laid even with the ground, that there was no longer anything to lead those who visited the spot to believe that it had ever been inhabited." * By Robinson and others, the massive outworks of the present citadel are regarded as Roman; and there is every reason for holding, that when Adrian rebuilt and fortified the city, he placed again the citadel on the commanding site of the old one, retaining one of the ancient towers—namely, Hippicus—but probably demolishing the others for the sake of their materials. In the eleventh century, when the city was captured by the Crusaders, this fortress was the last portion of the city to be surrendered. William of Tyre speaks of it as a place of immense strength, "built of squared stones, joined together as it were inseparably, by cement and liquid lead." In the 13th century, when the walls of the city were overthrown by the Saracens, this fortress was spared; and down to the 16th century it continued to be known by the name of the Tower, or Castle, of David.

As the traveller enters the city by the Jaffa gate, the single tower which stands on the inner side at the north-east part of the citadel, at once arrests his attention. Its upper part, for about 20 feet in height, is obviously modern, not differing in appearance or style from the other walls and towers around, and is probably to be assigned to the time of the Crusades; but its lower part, about 40 feet high, bears the unmistakeable marks of a hoary and venerable antiquity. Were the rubbish, which has accumulated in the fosse at the bottom removed, the height of this ancient part of the tower would probably be found to be considerably greater. The stones are smaller than those of the temple wall, and though rebated in the characteristic style of the Jewish architecture, their faces are not reduced to a plain smooth surface, but remain rough and protuberant. These differences, indicating a less massive and less careful style of masonry, are quite in accordance with the Herodian age of the tower. It measures 56 by 70 feet. Dr Robinson states that his conviction (which he shared with Scholz, Raumer, and others), that this was no other than the Hippicus tower, was strengthened as he daily passed and repassed the

* Wars, vii. 1, sec. 1.

fortress ; and a careful inspection left no room for doubt. He found that there is no known or visible entrance to the ancient part, either from above or below ; and that no one knew of any room or space in it. Its history, its position, its architectural style, its solidity, make the proof of its identity complete. It is worthy of notice that Josephus, in this instance, *understates* the size of the tower ; and the discrepancy is explained by the probable supposition, that in minute details of measurement he depended entirely on his recollections or general impressions.

From the position of Hippicus, we are able to determine the line of the first or old wall. "It began on the north at the tower called Hippicus, and, passing over the brow of Zion, extended as far as the Xystus, and then joining to the council house" (which probably stood near the site of the modern Mekhemeh), "ended at the west cloister of the temple."* From the same point we can also trace the old southern boundary of the city. "It began at the same tower, and extended to the gate of the Essenes"—coinciding probably with the line of the modern city wall from the Jaffa gate to its south-west corner : "and after that it went with a southern aspect above the fountain of Siloam, whence it again inclined, facing the east towards Solomon's reservoir, and, extending to a certain spot designated Ophla (Ophel), it joined the eastern colonnade of the temple." Interesting traces of this portion of the ancient fortifications of the upper city have been found. When levelling the ground for the cemetery connected with the English Church, which is situated on the south-west brow of Zion, near the Coenaculum, or Neby David, steps were discovered cut out of the solid rock. These have been recently laid bare by Lieut. Warren to the number of 36. The scarped rock above the landing of these stairs, appears to have been part of the line of the ancient rampart ; and, with a wall running along its summit, which it would doubtless have, it would offer a formidable front to a scaling enemy ; for the rock-scarp alone has a perpendicular face of 29 feet in height. These are not improbably the "stairs of David," by which he and his men went up when they wrested the strong-hold of the Jebusites out of their hands ; and they seem to be those which are referred to by Nehemiah, when he speaks of the stairs, at some little distance from Siloam, "that go down from the city of David." Scarped rock has also been bared by Mr Warren above the Pool of Siloam, for 30 feet in length, and found to be 4 feet high—although at one period the height has been much greater, as extensive quarrying has lately been carried on at this point. This scarped rock, in all probability, marks the course of the old wall.

* Joseph. Wars, v. 4, sec. 2.

The wall which ran along the brow of Ophel, and joined the eastern colonnade of the temple, has been laid bare at its point of junction, and traced southward to a distance of 300 feet from the Haram area. This discovery is of great value, as proving, in accordance with the testimony of Josephus, that the south wall of the temple extended from the Tyropoeon on the west, to the brink of the Kedron valley on the east. A tower or bastion has also been discovered, with a face of 23 feet 6 inches, projecting about 8 feet from the line of the wall. This wall of Ophel was struck at a depth of 4 feet from the surface. Its upper course of stones is 3 feet 9 inches high; they appear to have been rebated and carefully dressed, but are much worn. The average height of the other courses is less than two feet. The wall was found to be thirteen feet in thickness at top; and Lieut. Warren believes that at the depth of 60 feet from the surface, it will be 15 feet thick. He ascertained that the top of this wall projects 18 inches beyond the line of the visible part of the eastern Haram wall. It is not improbable that were the exploration of this wall prosecuted, traces would be discovered of the "water gate" toward the east, and the "tower that lieth out," * which Nehemiah speaks of in connection with Ophel: that the gate would be found to be near the fountain of the Virgin; and that the tower, projecting considerably eastward from the line of the wall, would be found to have covered or scaled the fountain, so as to secure it against an enemy in a time of siege.

In fixing the line of what Josephus terms "the second wall," which formed the northern boundary of the city in the time of the first Herod, we start from the gate of Gennath, which was near the tower of Hippicus. It took a circuitous course round to Antonia, encompassing the tract which lay to the north of the upper city, in distinction from the tract which came to be embraced in the third wall erected by Agrippa. This course must have lain to the west of the pool of Hezekiah, which was within the confines of the ancient city. It is plain, from the testimony of the Jewish historian, when describing the assault of Titus on the second wall, that it ran about 45 feet to the west of that pool, the "Pool of Amygdalon," or the *Pool of Hezekiah*, for their identity is unquestioned. Besides, in an angle of the present city wall, near the Latin convent, there are the remains of an ancient wall, built of large hewn and bevelled stones; and near this spot are blocks so large, that Messrs Wolcott and Tipping took them at first to be the natural rock, but on closer examination they were found to be bevelled. They ascertained that an unusually large proportion

* Neh. iii. 26.

of the stones in the present wall, between the north-west corner of the city and the Damascus gate, and also of those in the adjacent buildings, are ancient and bevelled, and could not resist the impression that this had been nearly the course of some ancient wall.* Dr Wilson, too, states that the wall westward of the Damascus gate, "for some extent above its foundation, bears, in the magnitude and peculiarity of its stones, the evidence of its great antiquity;" and he regards this as a relic of the ancient second wall.† The ancient remains found at the gate of Damascus, are now universally recognised as belonging to an ancient gate on the same spot, and connected with the second wall. The conclusion of Dr Robinson from these facts, confirmed by all subsequent examination, was, that "the course of the second wall nearly followed the line of the street which leads northwards from the citadel to the Latin convent, deflecting perhaps a little on the east or west of that street; while from the convent to the Damascus gate it lay along or near the course of the present city wall."‡ To the east of this gate it no doubt ran to the top of the rocky ridge, which has been scarped on the north side for purposes of defence, and then deflected southward, following the summit of the ridge of Bezetha, till it joined Antonia, at the west end of the fosse, as shewn in our sketch.


Having thus traced the boundaries of the ancient city, and identified its principal landmarks, we are in a position to comprehend the sketch in which Josephus briefly outlines the Jerusalem of his day, and to compare its leading localities and features with those of the modern city.

The city, properly so called, as distinguished from the temple which stood on mount Moriah, lay on two hills facing each other; and the buildings which stood on them terminated at the intervening valley, called the Tyropœon. An open space, perhaps a roadway, extended along the bottom of this glen or gully. The hill which bore the upper city, was the culminating point of the ridge. On account of the strength of its position, and its fortifications, the upper city was called the citadel or stronghold, and it is obvious from 2 Sam. v. 7, that it was the same as Zion. Zion was bounded on the north and east by the Tyropœon, which must have run on the north side of the hill, parallel to the first wall, and on approaching the temple curved to the south, separating between the temple and Zion, and descending as far southwards as Siloam. This is one of the vexed questions of Jerusalem topography; but topographers of the highest eminence have for many centuries held

* *Biblioth. Sac.*, 1848, p. 29.

† *Lands of the Bible*, i. 421.

‡ *Later Researches*, p. 219.



that this was the course of the Tyropœon valley, and that they were right is now proved beyond question, by excavations eastward of the Jaffa gate, which shew that a deep depression must have once existed where one is now hardly perceptible, because filled up by immense accumulations of rubbish.

Acra, or the lower city, lay to the north of Zion, corresponding to the part of the modern city where the Church of the Holy Sepulchre is situated. A broad valley originally separated it on the east from the hill Bezetha, which, during the reign of the Asmoneans, was filled up, for the purpose of joining the city to the temple.

Bezetha, a fourth hill, lay to the north of Antonia, and was immediately adjacent to it, being divided from it by a deep fosse or trench, which was cut for the purpose of increasing the height of the towers of the fortress, and rendering it inaccessible to an enemy. Ophel was the ridge of mount Moriah, running southward to the point where the Hinnom and Kedron valleys unite.

The water supply of Jerusalem is a subject of very peculiar interest, and there are several questions relating to it, which have given rise to much ingenious speculation, but which are still unsettled. Though situated in a region of limestone, where fountains and wells are comparatively rare, the city seems seldom to have suffered, even in times of siege, from an insufficient supply of water. Strabo described it "as a rocky, well-enclosed fortress, well watered within, wholly dry without;" and the accuracy of his laconic delineation has been frequently proved; as, for instance, when the Romans under Antiochus Pius, or the Crusaders in the Middle Ages, besieged it, and were in the greatest straits from thirst, while the inhabitants were plentifully supplied with water. Its chief dependence ever has been, as it still is, on its numerous cisterns and tanks for collecting rain water. "Its inhabitants," says William of Tyre, "use only rain water. For during the winter months they are accustomed to collect the showers for themselves in the cisterns, which exist in great numbers in the city, and to store them up for the whole year for necessary uses."* Every private house of consequence is supplied with one of these, which are excavated in the soft limestone on which the city stands; and some houses have as many as three or four, of considerable dimensions, varying from 8 or 10 feet square, to

* "Est autem locus in quo civitas sita est, aridus et inaquosus, rivos, fontes, ac flumina non habens penitus, cujus habitatores aquis tantum utuntur pluvialibus. Mensibus enim hibernis, in cisternis quas in civitate habent plurimas, imbres solent sibi colligere, et per totum annum ad usus necessarios conservare."

thrice that extent. With proper care, the water, which is conducted into them from the roofs of the houses, remains pure and sweet during the summer and autumn. In this way all the public buildings are provided with water. The Latin convent is said to have 28 cisterns, so that in seasons of great drought it can deal out to all the Christian part of the community the supply which is needed. This practice of storing the rain in cisterns, would seem to have been handed down from the first citizens, the ancient Jebusites. For beneath the line of the viaduct which Solomon constructed between the temple and the opposite hill, there were discovered, in September last, ancient tanks, excavated in the solid rock, and one built of masonry above the rock, which must, of course, have existed prior to the erection of the piers of that roadway. All over the region northwards of the city, which was once included within its walls, and occupied with dwellings, there are traces of ancient water-tanks cut out of the rock, doubtless for the supply of the inmates of the houses which stood over them. And if in any part of Jerusalem a shaft is sunk for the purpose of discovering what is entombed beneath the "heap" on which it is "built," the probability is that, whatever else is brought to light, a water-tank will be found there. At the Muristan, or Hospital of the Knights of St John, Lieut. Warren found, 28 feet below the surface, an opening leading into arched dry tanks of immense size, the bottoms of which are roughly estimated to be 53 feet below the surface of the ground; the first tank being 40 by 17 feet, another 68 by 17, and other two of smaller size. These appear to be by far the most extensive underground cisterns yet known in Jerusalem, outside the Haram. The stones were of large size and well dressed.

The same causes which led to the excavation of these private cisterns, account for the formation of large and capacious reservoirs for more general use. Of these, the first place is due to the pools which bear the name of Solomon (called by the Arabs "El Burak," the pools), situated about eight miles from Jerusalem, near the head of Wady Urtas, which is supposed to be the site of ancient Etham. There seems no valid reason for questioning the accuracy of the tradition, according to which these are the pools to which the splendour-loving son of David alludes in Ecclesiastes. Their great antiquity is undoubted; and it is manifest that they were mainly constructed for the purpose of supplying the city with living water. The aqueduct is conducted by a sinuous course, through Bethlehem to Jerusalem. Having reached the valley of Gihon, it passes round the lower pool bearing the name of that valley, about 75 yards above it, on nine or ten arches, now nearly concealed by an accumulation of earth; but, before doing so, sends off a

branch to the troughs of a monumental fountain, situated at the end of the pool, and raised in honour of Sultan Mohammed, by whom the aqueduct was probably repaired in the 14th century. After winding around the S.W. part of Zion, it passes through the city wall, and is carried along the steep eastern declivity of the hill, and having penetrated the rock by a short tunnel, it is believed to be conveyed across the valley of the Tyropœon by a mound or causeway, termed by Pierotti "a bridge," and thence to the Haram. A portion of the ancient aqueduct has been discovered south of the Coenaculum, and traced for a distance of 500 feet to near the English School on the S.W. brow of Zion, where the two aqueducts cross, shewing that the old line nearly coincided with the modern one. Indeed, at some points they unite, the original work not having been disturbed. This portion of a former aqueduct, which Lieut. Warren describes as "evidently of most ancient construction," and which he believes to have been *the original aqueduct* from Solomon's pools, is in some parts cut out of the rock, in others built of masonry; generally of a semi-cylindrical shape, but varying in size. In some places it is 12 feet high, and the stones at the sides measure 12 feet by 6. The plaster is still in good preservation. This channel, which was quite concealed from an enemy, in consequence of the depth at which it was driven, must have been of great consequence in olden times, as appears from the well-cut shafts which lead to it; and a reliable supply could be drawn from it by the city. Although, however, we can trace this aqueduct to a point near the Haram, and must reckon its connection with the large reservoirs there a certainty, we do not know the manner of that connection, the point of its entrance, nor the arrangement, if there be any, for the escape of the overflow supply. These are questions yet to be solved by further exploration, when ampler facilities than now exist shall be afforded for that purpose.

A few facts may be stated respecting these reservoirs. Dr Barclay having observed on one of his visits to the area, that the removal of a half-buried marble capital disclosed a rude passage leading to a long flight of steps, the Effendi, who patronised him, immediately despatched an order for flambeaux, and prepared for an exploration. Descending a broad flight of 44 steps cut in the rock, they reached a beautiful sheet of water. The cavern was found to be 736 feet in circuit and 44 in height, and at a moderate calculation, might contain a million of gallons. The rock-vaulted roof is supported by piers of rough unhewn rock. "The rain from El Aksa is conducted into it by a small trench, and much also enters by small superficial channels leading from various parts of the temple area into the same opening." This large subterranean

basin or collection of water, is variously called the "sea," "great reservoir," or "royal cistern" of the temple. Of its great antiquity there can be no doubt. Dr Barclay did not succeed in discovering the entrance of the aqueduct from Solomon's Pools, which he had been told enters it from the west. Pierotti, in his map of the Haram, indicates, but, so far as appears, without any authority, a connection between the two.

Lieut. Warren has discovered, to the east of the mosque of El Aksa, three tanks of large dimensions, the bottom of which is upwards of 60 feet below the exterior surface of the ground, containing a superficial area of 4,400 square feet, and computed to be capable of holding 700,000 gallons of water.

The number of well-mouths with which the Haram area is studded, seems to indicate that the rock beneath is honey-combed with tanks or reservoirs.

According to Kadi Mejr Eddin, the Moslem historian, there were 34 of these wells or reservoirs in the Haram yard, three and a half centuries ago; and seven were beneath the great central platform. That to which he gives most prominence, and which appears to have been situated near to the entrance to the Cotton Bazaar (the Bab-el-Katannin), was the "well of the leaf." Dr Barclay counted 32 well-mouths; but he states that the larger wells have each several mouths, and that some of the reservoirs are now disused and filled with rubbish.

There have been many theories broached respecting the remarkable well, near the Haram, which supplies the "bath of healing," called Hummâm es-shefa. The depth of this well beneath the surface of the ground, is not less than sixty-six feet. Its shaft is connected underneath with curiously built chambers and rock-hewn caves and passages, which have been explored as far as 105 feet south from the well, and which are said to extend twice as far. It has usually been supposed that this singular well is fed from a large fountain, within the precincts of the Haram; but this supposition is not countenanced by the fact that the subterranean channel along which the water flows, instead of coming from the east, in the direction of the Haram, approaches the well from the south. The accounts which Wolcott and Barclay have given of their descent into these mysterious recesses, however well fitted to gratify the love of the marvellous, throw no light on the questions, Does this well depend on some deep and ancient aqueduct? and has it any connection with the Virgin's fount?

Looking at the nature of the ground to the west of Jerusalem, and taking in connection with the statements of Scripture (as in 2 Kings xviii. 17; xx. 20; 2 Chron. xxxii. 30; Isa. vii. 3; xxxvi. 2), certain references of the son of Sirach and Josephus, Dr Robinson concluded that there must have existed anciently

a fountain Gihon, somewhere in the locality of the Birket el Mamilla, the present upper pool of Gihon. The Gihon, "whose upper water course," or the upper outflow of whose waters "was stopped" or covered over "by king Hezekiah," must clearly have been situated in this quarter; for it was brought down to "the west side of the city of David." Hezekiah's object was to secure these waters for the inhabitants in case of a siege, and cut them off from the besiegers. This he could do by digging a deep reservoir, and erecting over it one or more subterranean chambers, as we know was done with one of the fountains which supply Solomon's pools. From this it could be brought by underground channels into the city, and distributed among various reservoirs and fountains. It seems every way probable that this was done; and that the pool of Hezekiah, still existing, whose great antiquity is undoubted, was one of these pools. The aqueduct which, as Josephus states, conveyed water to the tower of Hippicus, and to Herod's palace on Mount Zion, both in the near vicinity of Hezekiah's pool, may have been supplied from the same source. The pool is in fact now fed from the upper Gihon basin. While concluding, on a view of the whole evidence, that the modern pool is to be held to be the representative of the ancient fountain, as indicating at least its locality, the author of the "Researches" admits, that before perfect certainty could be arrived at, excavation in this neighbourhood would be necessary. These views were strikingly corroborated by the discovery, at a later period, of an "immense conduit" beneath the surface of the ground, near the tower of Hippicus, when a foundation was being dug for the Anglican Church, which is believed to stand on a portion of the ancient site of the royal palace of Herod. Mr Johns, the architect, states that, in sinking a shaft, the workmen at the depth of more than 20 feet, came on the roof of a vaulted chamber, of a very superior description of masonry, within which there were steps leading towards a solid mass of stonework laid in courses. On carefully removing one of the stones, he found "an immense conduit, partly hewn out of the solid rock, and when this was not the case, solidly built in even courses, and cemented on the face with a hard coating of cement, covered over with large stones, retaining still a surface such as is rarely found in modern erections."* The direction of this aqueduct was east and west. It was nearly level. Its purpose was obviously the supply of the inhabitants with water, there being several apertures at distant intervals; so that by means of a line and bucket, water could at any time be procured. Here, then, in all probability is the aqueduct

* "Bartlett's Walks around Jerusalem," p. 83.

which we know from Josephus, anciently supplied the tower of Hippicus and the royal palace on Zion. Nor is it an improbable supposition that has been entertained by Robinson and others, that the waters of that fountain which Hezekiah covered, may still continue to flow, by deep subterranean channels down to the temple area, supplying the deep wells near the Haram connected with the Hummâm es-shefa.

The identity of the fountain and pool of Siloam with the Siloam of Isaiah, Nehemiah, and the Evangelists, is unquestionable. Josephus, who makes frequent mention of Siloam as a fountain, says expressly that the valley of the Tyropœon extended down to it; in other words, that it was situated in the mouth of the Tyropœon, where it is found now. The later historical notices of it, and they are numerous, from Jerome downwards, go to establish this identity very satisfactorily.

It is equally clear that Dr Robinson is right, when he identifies the fountain of the virgin, on the west side of the valley of Jehoshaphat, with the "king's pool" of Nehemiah, and the "pool of Solomon" mentioned by Josephus, near which the wall of the city passed as it ran northwards from Siloam along the valley of Jehoshaphat, to the eastern side of the temple. The irregular flow of the waters at both these fountains is as yet an unsolved mystery. Dr Barclay,* who speaks of the spring at the virgin's fountain as "rushing furiously like a mountain torrent for twenty or thirty minutes, then intermitting for one or two hours, or, in dry seasons, even a day or two," confidently assigns as the cause of this remarkable phenomenon, the natural action of a siphon-shaped reservoir in the heart of the mountain. But this is an utterly unsupported hypothesis. The fact of the intermittent flow at both places is explained by the connection of the two through the subterranean passage or canal cut out in the solid rock. Of this canal not a few explorations have been made since the commencement of the 17th century, when it appears from Quaresmius, that one Pater Julius passed through it. Yet, so recently as 1839, the question was still undecided, though very easy, surely, of settlement, whether the water flows from the virgin's fountain to Siloam, or *vice versa*. The successful attempts of Drs Robinson and Smith to traverse this underground aqueduct, which set the question at rest, is one of the most graphically told of their adventures, and quite relieves the grave and learned pages of the "Researches." Entering at the Siloam end, they found the rock-hewn channel about two feet wide, the water for the most part not more than 3 or 4 inches deep, with hardly a perceptible current; the height of the

* "City of the Great King," p. 520.

passage from 15 to 20 feet for some distance, but becoming gradually lower and lower, till, at the distance of 800 feet, it became so low that they could not advance without crawling on all fours, and bringing their bodies close to the water. As they were not prepared for this, they resolved to beat a retreat; and try again at a future time, from the other end. Accordingly, marking the spot, they returned with their clothes wet and soiled. Having found that the distance above ground between the two fountains was 1100 feet, they concluded there could not remain over three or four hundred feet to be explored. In this calculation, they found afterwards that they made too little allowance for the numerous windings of the passage. They found it much lower at this end than at the other. Most of the way they could advance on their hands and knees, but in several places they could only get forward by lying at full length, and dragging themselves along on their elbows. From the many turns and zigzags, the way seemed interminably long. But at length, after having measured 950 feet, they arrived at their former mark of 800 feet, thus making the entire length of the canal, assuming the measurement to be correct, 1750 feet, or several hundred feet greater than the direct distance outside.

Lieut. Warren, who also explored this channel, confirms, in his narrative, the statement of Dr Robinson in every particular. He says:—

“ We entered from the Siloam end, so as to have as much clean work as possible. For the first 350 feet it was very plain sailing: the height of the passage sloping down from 16 feet at entrance to 4 feet 4 inches, the width 2 feet; the direction, a wavy line to the east. At 450 feet the height of the passage was reduced to 3 feet 9 inches, and here we found a shaft leading upwards apparently to the open air. This might be made use of to great advantage by the owners of the soil overhead. From this shaft the passage takes a N.E. direction, and at 600 feet is only 2 feet 6 inches high. Our difficulties now commenced. Sergeant Birtles, with a fellâh, went ahead, measuring with tape, while I followed with compass and field-book. The bottom is a soft silt, with a calcareous crust at top, strong enough to bear the human weight, except in a few places where it lets one in with a flop. Our measurements of height were taken from the top of this crust, as it now forms the bottom of the aqueduct; the mud silt is from 15 inches to 18 inches deep. We were now crawling all fours, and thought we were getting on very pleasantly, the water being only 4 inches deep, and we were not wet higher than our hips. Presently bits of cabbage-stalks came floating by, and we suddenly awoke to the fact that the waters were rising. The Virgin's Fount is used as a sort of scullery to the Silwan village, the refuse thrown there being carried off down the passage each time the water rises. The rising of the waters had not been anticipated, as they had risen only two hours

previous to our entrance. At 850 feet the height of the channel was reduced to 1 foot 10 inches, and here our troubles began. The water was running with great violence, one foot in height, and we, crawling full length, were up to our necks in it.

"I was particularly embarrassed; one hand necessarily wet and dirty, the other holding a pencil, compass, and field-book, the candle for the most part in my mouth. Another 50 feet brought us to a place where we had regularly to run the gauntlet of the waves. The passage being only 1 foot 4 inches high, we had just 4 inches breathing space, and had some difficulty in twisting our necks round properly. When observing, my mouth was under water. At 900 feet we came upon two false cuttings, one on each side of the aqueduct. They go in for about two feet each. I could not discover any appearance of their being passages; if they are, and are stopped up for any distance, it will be next to impossible to clear them out in such a place. Just here I involuntarily swallowed a portion of my lead pencil, nearly choking for a minute or two. We were now going in a zig-zag direction towards the north-west, and the height increased to 4 feet 6 inches, which gave us a little breathing space; but at 1,050 feet we were reduced to 2 feet 6 inches, and at 1100 feet we were again crawling with a height of only 1 foot 10 inches. We should probably have suffered more from the cold than we did, had not our risible faculties been excited by the sight of our fellâh in front, plunging and puffing through the water like a young grampus. At 1150 feet the passage again averaged a height of 2 feet to 2 feet 6 inches. At 1400 feet we heard the same sound of water dripping as described by Captain Wilson, the Rev. Dr Barclay, and others. I carefully looked backwards and forwards, and at last found a fault in the rock, where the water was gurgling, but whether rushing in or out I could not ascertain. At 1450 feet we commenced turning to the east, and the passage attained the height of 6 feet. At 1658 feet we came upon our old friend, the passage leading to the Ophel shaft, and, after a further 50 feet, to the Virgin's Fount. Our candles were just becoming exhausted, and the last three angles I could not take very exactly. There were fifty-seven stations of the compass. When we came out it was dark. . . . We were nearly four hours in the water. I find a difference of 42 feet between my measurements and those of Dr Robinson; but if he took the length of the Virgin's Fount into account we shall very nearly agree."

Whence does the water of the Virgin's Fount come? Is it an independent spring? Or does it flow from Zion, or from some one of the reservoirs or cisterns beneath the Sakhrah? Dr Barclay has written in his "City of the Great King," as if he wished the world to believe that his explorations have proved that the supply comes by an underground passage across Ophel from Zion. Several writers that came after him, Mr Lewin and Mr Ferguson included, have accepted his testimony on this point without question. Undoubtedly the impression naturally conveyed by the language of the two following

passages in Dr Barclay's book, justified these writers in putting upon it the interpretation they did :—

“ In exploring the subterranean channel conveying the water from Virgin's Fount to Siloam, I discovered a similar channel entering from the north, a few yards from its commencement ; and in tracing it up near the Mugrabin gate, where it became so choked with rubbish that it could be traversed no further, I there found it to turn to the west, in the direction of the south end of the cleft or saddle of Zion.”—P. 309.

Again,

“ The tortuous channel that conveys this stream to the Pool of Siloam has been thoroughly examined by Drs Robinson and Smith, as well as by some few other adventurous explorers ; but I was not so successful myself, having reached a point—after crawling several hundred feet—where, owing to an accumulation of rubbish, there was barely room to keep my mouth out of the water, even when my head was pressed against the upper surface of the channel. I was compelled to abandon the enterprise, and *crawfish* it as best I could. . . . These gentlemen, however, are evidently mistaken in their conclusion that ‘ there is no lateral passage by which water might come in from another quarter.’ On closely examining a passage turning north, at a distance of 49 feet from the upper extremity, it was found to be the termination of the channel leading across Ophel from Mount Zion, and explored as far as a point near the present Mugrabin gate.”—Pp. 517, 518.

In these passages, Dr Barclay seems distinctly to state that he personally explored the passage *from the Virgin's Fount* to a point near the Mugrabin gate, that is, to a point west of Dr Robinson's arch. But the writers referred to, did not observe a *third passage*, in which Dr Barclay divulges a material circumstance suppressed in the two preceding statements, and one which deprives them of all value as bearing on the point in hand. He says :—

“ The thought occurred to me one very warm day, whilst residing on Mount Olivet, that an attempt to ascertain the true origin of this mysterious streamlet might neither be an unprofitable nor unpleasant way of spending an hour or two. I accordingly commenced my subter-aquatic explorations as stealthily as possible, for fear of raising a mob, crawling about with only a single candle in hand. Having loitered in the pool till the coming down of the waters, I soon found several widely separated places where it gained admittance, besides the opening under the steps, where alone it had formerly been supposed to enter. I then observed a large opening entering the rock-hewn channel, just below the pool, which, though once supplying a tributary quite copious—if we may judge from its size—is now dry. Being found too much choked with tessara (*sic*) and rubbish to be penetrated far, I carefully noted its position and bearing, and, on

searching for it above, soon identified it *on the exterior*, where it assumed an upward direction toward the temple, and, *entering it through a breach*, traversed it for nearly 1000 feet; sometimes walking erect, at other times bending low, now on hand and knee, and not unfrequently inching my way snake-fashion, until at last I reached a point near the wall, where I heard the donkeys nimbly tripping over my head; and then, the pioneer of our party getting lodged, we were compelled to back out and retrace our way. I was perfectly satisfied, however, on subsequently locating our course above ground with the theodolite, that this subterraneous canal derived its former supply of water, not from Moriah but from Zion."—P. 528.

The plain English of this is, that Dr Barclay found a subterranean passage, branching off from the main aqueduct 49 yards from its commencement, and about 40 feet below the outer surface of the rock; and not being able to get into it from its being choked up with tesserae, he mounted the hill *outside*, and there identified with the passage 40 feet below, *the main drain of the city*, which is generally only a few feet beneath the surface of the earth, and which runs in the direction he describes, being not cut out of the rock, but built of masonry!

This passage, turning northwards from the main tunnel, (called by Lieutenant Warren, in the previous quotation from his progress-reports, "our old friend, the passage leading to the Ophel Shaft") which Dr Barclay, after all, did not search, the enterprising engineer, after clearing out the accumulated deposit (not "tesserae") of centuries at its entrance, has thoroughly explored, with an adventurous courage rarely surpassed. Toiling through a long day, from sunrise to sunset, in the very heart of Ophel, he found that the opening leads by a rock-cut channel to a perpendicular shaft of 40 feet, smoothly quarried out of solid rock; after this to caverns and difficult passages,—one of them rising at an angle of 45 degrees,—which conduct to a large vaulted chamber, the arch formed of well cut squared stone, nine feet wide and twenty feet in height, and running northwest for about 20 feet, with a deep pit sunk beneath its floor, and a smaller one about 8 feet deeper, from which there issued a blocked-up passage. A plan and section of these ancient subterranean excavations are almost necessary to enable our readers to comprehend the description of them. The curious articles which the lieutenant and his companion found in these mysterious recesses, show plainly enough some of the purposes for which, in all probability, they were originally excavated. In the vaulted chamber they found a pile of charcoal, as if for cooking; a glass lamp of curious construction; a cooking-dish, glazed inside; and a pitcher of red pottery for water. The horizontal passage leading to the shaft was lined with piles of loose stones, as if to be ready for being thrown down the shaft,

and at intervals glass lamps, similar to that found in the vaulted chamber, were placed on these piles of stones, obviously to light the passage to the shaft. Overhanging the shaft was an iron ring, to which a rope might have been attached for hauling up water. The passage which branches off from the aqueduct to Siloam, is thus ascertained to be not a tributary but a water conduit from the Virgin's Pool to the shaft, which in times of siege may have served as the draw-well to the ancient inhabitants of Ophel, that iron-ring being used for attaching the well rope; and hence in olden times this part of the city would have a limitless supply of water at command, which no beleaguering force could intercept or cut off; and the vaulted room must have been used as a place of refuge. These discoveries strikingly illustrate and confirm the remarks of Dr Robinson, in reference to the purpose for which so difficult a work was undertaken as the channel between the two fountains:—

“ There must have been something to be gained by carrying the waters through the solid rock into the valley of the Tyropœon. . . . The whole looks as if the advantage of a fortified city had been taken into the account, and as if it had been important to carry this water from one point to the other in such a way that it could not be cut off by a besieging army. Now, as this purpose would have been futile had either of these points been without the ancient fortifications, this circumstance furnishes an additional argument to show that the ancient wall probably ran along the Valley of Jehoshaphat, or at least descended to it, and included both Siloam and this upper fountain (the Virgin's), which then either constituted or supplied the ‘ King's Pool,’ or ‘ Pool of Solomon.’ ”

Below the junction of the valleys of Hinnom and Kedron, there is a copious well of sweet water, Bir Eyûb, from which a large supply is daily conveyed to the city by donkeys. It is 125 feet deep, walled up with large squared stones, terminating above on one side in an arch, and obviously of great antiquity. In the rainy season it becomes full, and sometimes overflows; but usually the surplus water runs off by an underground channel, and finds an outlet further down the wady. The identity of this well with the En-rogel of Joshua and of the first Book of Kings, has been clearly shown by Robinson, Williams, and others. Dr Bonar, indeed, has attempted to set up a claim by various arguments in favour of the Fountain of the Virgin being reckoned the En-rogel of the Old Testament; but his pleading seems to us to be inconclusive. Lieutenant Warren has opened the spring (at the distance of more than a quarter of a mile below En-rogel), which is probably fed by the overflow of its waters. Working at a depth of 12 feet, a stone suddenly rolled away, revealing a staircase 25 feet deep, which conducted

to passages cut out in the solid rock, but filled with silt, in which, when cleaned out, a man of six feet high may walk erect. Upwards of a hundred feet of this passage leading northwards to the well has been cleared, and its thorough exploration may very probably lead to some interesting discovery, in connection with the means which were anciently employed to cover the Jerusalem waters, and lead them off, so as to be out of the reach of a besieging force. We are told that "when Hezekiah saw that Sennacherib was purposed to fight against Jerusalem, he took counsel with his princes and his mighty men to stop the waters of the fountains which were *without* the city, and they did help him. So there was gathered much people together, who stopped all the fountains and the brook that ran through the midst of the land saying, 'Why should the kings of Assyria come and find much water?'"* There is every probability that these subterranean passages, which must have been executed at immense labour and no little cost, are part of the very works which were resolved upon by Hezekiah and his mighty men, at the time mentioned by the historian, for purposes of self-defence against an enemy; and it shews the skill of the "royal engineers" of Jerusalem, in the times of Solomon and Hezekiah, that their contrivances have remained so long a profound secret, having hitherto baffled the inquiries even of able European explorers.

In the Book of Joshua, which has been felicitously called "the Domesday Book of Palestine," mention is made in connection with En-rogel of "the fountain of the water of Nephtoah." The boundary between Judah and Benjamin ran from En-rogel up the valley of Hinnom, on the south side of Jerusalem, to the top of the hill lying westward of the valley of Hinnom. A glance at the map will show that this must have been the very course which the Jaffa road now takes to the north-west of the upper Gihon pool. The border was then drawn from the top of the hill to "the fountain of the water of Nephtoah," which must clearly have been some remarkable well or spring, two or three miles to the north-west of Jerusalem. Now, Ain Liftah, which lies about half-an-hour to the W.N.W. of the city, and which is now, according to Dr Stewart ("Tent and Khan")† "recognised as the ancient Nephtoah," fulfils all the conditions mentioned in Joshua, in distance from the city, position, and name. It is situated in a deep narrow wady, and its waters issue out of the hill behind, falling into a small pool which is formed in an arcade or porch cut out of the rock. Lieutenant Warren has examined a singular fissure here, with which there are many traditions associated. The entrance from

* 2d Chron. xxxii., 2-4.

† P. 849.

the top only allows of a man squeezing himself through ; but as the explorer descends, swung at the end of a rope, the chasm, which is perpendicular, gradually widens and enlarges. At the depth of 125 feet, it is about 15 feet long by 30 inches wide. At the bottom, 155 feet below the surface, the water, which drips in considerable quantity from the sides of the fissure, flows into a narrow crevice, which Mr Warren found too narrow to examine. He thinks that this cleft is partly natural, partly artificial, and that it may be found to be connected in some remarkable and hitherto unknown way with the water supply of Jerusalem. What if there should turn out to be a hidden communication between this fountain of Nephtoah and the upper Gihon pool ? or with En-rogel itself ? and what if "the brook which ran through the midst of the land" ran through the Gihon and Hinnom valleys, receiving its supply from "the well of waters of Nephtoah ?" In other parts of the city, as for example at the Damascus gate, and in the great cavern under Bezetha, there are curious sounds of running water, as if flowing in some hidden subterranean course, and Lieutenant Warren thinks it highly probable, from various concurrent circumstances, that such a stream does flow down the Tyropœon at a great depth, which may be opened up by future exploration.

One of the localities in Jerusalem in which the crowning interest of a large part of Christendom has centred for more than a thousand years, is the alleged site of the crucifixion and the sepulchre of our Lord, immediately to the east of the Greek convent. Pilgrimages were made to this spot in the fourth century, after the time of Constantine, and onwards. To wrest it from the hands of Mohammedans, to defend pilgrims to this shrine from the persecutions of the khalifs, and resent the barbarous cruelties which the Turks had perpetrated on Christian devotees, the crusades were set on foot,—those marvellous outbursts of religious fanaticism and chivalric daring, which, through a period of two hundred years, mark prominently the history of mediæval Europe. But the genuineness of this site of the sepulchre—covered by the church of the crusades—has been denied by many competent judges. No one has more clearly or forcibly shewn its apocryphal character, than Dr Robinson. It answers in no way to the Scripture narrative. It could not be "without the gate." The conclusions which we have already reached regarding the course of the wall which enclosed the northern part of the city, demonstrate that the grave of our Lord could not be in the place where monkish legends affirm it to have been. Closely adjacent, on the southwest, is the large pool of Hezekiah, which would not be left outside the walls for the benefit of an enemy in a time of siege ;

but if that reservoir was included, so likewise must have been the site of the present church. The excavations of Lieutenant Warren at the Muristan, or Hospital of the Knights of St John, point very distinctly to this same conclusion. There, old walls of houses were found, "running at each other in every direction;" not a vestige of the old city wall, which, it was supposed by some defenders of the claim of the church of the sepulchre, might be found in that quarter, but traces of the dwellings of the ancient Jerusalemites,—proving that this locality, which is hard by the so-called sepulchre, was not in the suburbs, but stood in the midst of the "compactly built" and crowded city. Nor are the traditional grounds on which the claim of this site rests of the slightest value. When carefully examined, they prove to be utterly unreliable. There is not a vestige of evidence to show that tradition, before the time of Constantine, pointed to that spot as "the place where the Lord lay." And even had there been such a tradition, it would have been wholly neutralised by the topographical evidence to the contrary. That church, therefore, is a falsehood in stone, and its sacred places are a tissue of deceptions.

Mr Ferguson, joining with Dr Robinson and others, in repudiating the claim of the church of the holy sepulchre, has set up another in behalf of the Kubbet-es-Sakhrah, which, he holds, is the real church of Constantine, built over the sepulchre of our Lord, and was so regarded in the earlier centuries.

Before describing the remarkable rock respecting which this keenly debated question has been raised, let us take a glance at the superb edifice which covers it. Till within the last few years, no infidel Frank dared to venture into the sacred enclosure within which the mosque stands, save at the risk of life and limb; and not a few learned and distinguished travellers, from Europe and America, have been driven from its vicinity with insults and threats of violence, lest they should defile it with their presence. Through the influence of the British and French Governments with the Sublime Porte, this barbarian exclusiveness is beginning to be broken down; and now, in spite of the dervishes, any Giaour who pays a sovereign for his ticket, through the resident consulate, may have the privilege, once rare indeed, not only of traversing the Haram area, but examining the interior of the mosque.

The Kubbet-es-Sakhrah, or, Dome of the Rock, stands on a raised platform, which, according to Pierotti, consists almost wholly of rock, but paved with marble, or white Palestine breccia, which covers about one-sixth part of the Haram area, and is placed near the middle of the sacred enclosure. As the area is not quite level, but slightly ascends towards the north-west corner, where the native rock appears, this marble plat-

form is not equally raised on all sides above the surrounding surface, but its average height is about ten feet. It is ascended by a short flight of steps, through a Saracenic screen, or gateway, consisting of a double row of arches, three below, and five in the upper range.

The mosque itself is 170 feet in diameter, and in form is octagonal, each side being 67 feet in extent. Anything more symmetrical than the circular dome which crowns the beautiful structure, cannot well be conceived. Its walls are lined with porcelain tiles of richest colour, the lower portion of the octagonal sides being encased with rich marble of various tints and devices. The circular portion of the building—or lower part of the dome—is pierced with sixteen windows of the finest stained glass, which admit a dim light. The lower, or octagonal portion of the mosque, which is 46 feet in height, has seven windows of stained glass in each side, or 56 in all. Above these windows numerous extracts from the Koran, painted in large Arabic characters, run round the entire building. The four doors face the cardinal points, that facing the south being the main entrance. The dome is supported by four very massive piers, each of the spaces between the piers being divided into three arches, which are supported on lofty marble pillars of various hues.

Right underneath the centre of this gorgeous dome is the celebrated rock (Sakhrah), from which the building derives its name. It is a mass of whitish limestone, "rough and unpolished as a sea-side boulder." It is 60 feet in length, and nearly the same in width, and rises four feet above the marble floor, so that, taking the average height of the platform to be, as we have stated, 10 feet, the rock is not less than 15 feet above the central part of the surface of the Haram area. This remarkable ridge of rock, with which so profound an interest is associated in Jews and Greeks, Franks and Turks, Christians and Mohammedans, is enclosed within a gilt iron railing, and screened by wooden lattice work, with here and there small openings, through which the faithful may put their hands and touch the holy rock. The parts which can be so reached are said to be polished by the touch of pilgrims for ages past.

Around the circle of pillars which supports the dome, there is an octagonal aisle, thirty feet wide, and this again is encompassed by an outer aisle, supported by eight piers and sixteen pillars. These numerous columns are, for the most part, of a purplish marble, with gilded Corinthian capitals.

"The impression which the whole gives," says Dr Wallace, describing his visit, "is that of massive strength and airy lightness combined. Everywhere the eye falls on beautiful arabesques and porcelain

tiles of bright colours. As the morning advanced, the rays of the sun streamed through the painted glass, and produced an almost magical effect as they fell upon the richly coloured tiles, whilst pier and pillar, floor and roof, threw back the many-tinted hues. Much as we had read about the place, we were greatly taken by surprise at the effect produced by the sun's rays falling on so many colours, and giving many parts of the building the appearance of a rainbow."—*The Desert and the Holy Land.*

In the south-east portion of the rock there is a natural vault or cave of irregular shape, about 15 feet wide and 18 in height. The ceiling of this cave, which is about four or five feet below the upper surface of the rock, is pierced with an aperture almost cylindrical, and about three feet in diameter. Its floor is paved with marble, and is said to cover another excavation beneath. The room is reached by steps cut in the solid rock, and at the entrance there is a projecting portion of the stone, resembling in shape a human tongue, which, from this circumstance, is called "the tongue of the rock," and which is regarded by the Moslems with very great veneration. It does not fall within our purpose to describe the many puerile and imbecile superstitions which the followers of the prophet connect with this spot,—a spot which, according to them, is the place of all others, next to the house of God at Mecca, where the prayers of men are acceptable to the Divinity. For this reason they hold, as we are informed by Ali Bey, that all the prophets of God, since the creation of the world, have come hither to pray, and that, even now, prophets and angels repair to the rock in invisible troops for prayer, in addition to the guard of 70,000 angels who perpetually surround it!

Now, the first argument by which Mr Ferguson seeks to prove that this Sakhras is the true sepulchre, rests on the architectural style of the mosque, and of the golden gate which, he affirms, was built as an entrance to it, and also to the church of Calvary, now destroyed.

"On both the gate and the mosque," says Mr Ferguson, "there is stamped the unmistakeable style of architecture which distinguished the age of Constantine. In any age previous to the seventeenth century, it is possible to frame a scale or test that will indicate the position of a building between those that precede and those that follow. This has been done for the Gothic style, and it can be done for the Corinthian, to which the buildings in question belong. That style was suggested by the Egyptians, perfected by the Greeks, enriched by the Romans, corrupted by the Byzantines. The golden gateway is later than the buildings of Palmyra and Baalbeck (A.D. 272), because they do not exhibit so much discrepancy from classic examples. It is earlier, because purer, than the style of Justinian's buildings

(A.D. 527). It is identical, and therefore cotemporary, with the tomb of St Constantia at Rome, which is of the time of Constantine."

Mr Ferguson therefore concludes :—

"I assert, most unhesitatingly, and defy contradiction to the fact, that it is a building of the first half of the fourth century, and it was built by Constantine himself." "If I had stumbled on this gateway in any part of the Roman world, I should never have hesitated two minutes in making up my mind that it was a festal gate of the age of Constantine."

While admitting that the *dome* of the mosque is modern, he maintains that the *main building* is of an earlier age ; that all that is necessary to give it its character, and decide the age of its erection, remains to this day ; and he challenges all who are capable of judging of the style of ancient architecture, to say at what period this building was constructed other than that which he has determined.

A second argument is based on the size of the temple enclosure, according to the dimensions stated by Josephus. He represents it, as we have already stated, as a square, four stadia in circumference, each side being a stadium in length, or about 600 feet. Now, as the Haram area is greatly larger than this, the inference is, that the temple must have stood at the south-west corner of the area, and that the *naos* could not stand where the mosque now is, the centre of the dome being upwards of 800 feet from the south wall of the platform. The Sakhrah must therefore have stood outside of the temple enclosure.

A third argument in support of the same theory, adduced by Mr Sandie, in his able and elaborate discussion of this question, is that a deep ravine or gorge separated the temple from the rock, and that on the north side of this ravine, near the rock, was a level piece of ground, which was the place of the crucifixion. The cave in the Sakhrah, he holds along with Mr Ferguson, is the veritable tomb of Joseph, in which the body of Jesus was laid. There are many other subordinate matters introduced into the argument, in handling which Mr Sandie exhibits considerable learning and no small amount of acuteness, dialectic skill, and controversial power. But in the three points now stated—and, we think, with fairness—is comprehended the pith of the evidence by which the theory is supported. If these three points could be made good, the subordinate theses would no doubt lend the theory additional strength, but if the main props give way, the lesser ones are useless. We must content ourselves with indicating our reply to this threefold argument in the briefest possible way.

While entertaining the highest respect for the opinion of Mr Ferguson on architectural questions,—a sentiment, however,

which is not intensified by his dogmatical and overbearing tone,—we cannot forget that other professional and cultivated men, architects and artists, men conversant with all architectural styles, and competent to form a judgment on such a question, have pronounced this mosque to be Saracenic, not Roman. Besides, if we are to credit history, and if the church erected by Constantine in honour of the sepulchre of our Lord stood on this spot, has it not been destroyed over and over again? If so, what becomes of the proof supplied by its architectural style? Mr Sandie has not grappled with this difficulty, but has rather given it the go-by. Moreover, even if it could be proved that Constantine built a church on this spot, it does not follow that the Sakhras is the sepulchre of our Lord, unless it can also be shewn that the emperor fixed on the true site. The latter point is by no means a corollary from the former.

The hypothesis which assumes as a postulate that the statement of Josephus regarding the dimensions of the temple enclosure is to be taken quite literally, making no allowance whatever for a slip of memory, is, in our judgment, overthrown by the evidence which we have already adduced, and which renders it a matter of *absolute certainty* that the present south wall of the Haram is, *in its entire length* (we speak of its lower courses), identical with the ancient temple wall, and that the temple enclosure extended from valley to valley, from the Tyropœon to the Kedron, as affirmed by Josephus—a fact in regard to which he could be under no mistake. The recent discovery of the wall of Ophel, “which joined the eastern colonnade of the temple,” completes the demonstration. Consequently, from the square form of the temple, it must have contained the Sakhras. And if the altar stood upon it, the position of the Sakhras was precisely what we should expect it to be from the statements of Josephus.

Again, the hypothesis which requires, as Mr Sandie’s does, that the plateau of the Haram should be cut across by a ravine to the *south* of the great mosque, by which the Sakhras was separated from the temple enclosure, is now conclusively and finally overturned. A ravine did intersect that plateau from west to east, but it ran, as Herr Schultz, the Prussian Consul at Jerusalem, shrewdly guessed and believed, and as Warren’s shafts and galleries have ascertained, to the *north* of the mosque. The rock gradually rises from the south end of the plateau northwards, until it crops up in the Sakhras as the hill-top. Besides, the great sea excavated out of rock,—which was discovered by Barclay, and seen by Mr Sandie himself,—might have convinced him that no ravine could ever have existed there. And Pierotti’s hitherto unchallenged ground-plan of the Haram, shews three or four other subterranean

reservoirs south of the Mosque, which—if we are to take the architect-engineer of the Pasha of Jerusalem as a credible witness—complete the proof on this head.

The acute, sustained, and ingenious argument by which Mr Sandie shews that there must have been *a branch ravine* of the Kedron separating Antonia from the temple, is, indeed, quite conclusive. It is borne out by recent discovery. But *the ascertained position* of the ravine explodes Mr Sandie's theory. Mr Sandie was right in holding that there was a ravine. He was wrong in placing it where he did. We regret to speak of a theory, which was so finely and elaborately spun, as being rent in pieces. But the demands of truth are inexorable.

What, then, was the Sakhrah? and how is the veneration with which it is regarded to be accounted for? The opinion of Dr Barclay, who "locates it within the north cloister" of the temple, for the purpose of getting it out of the way, and because, "unless in some way excluded from view, it would be an entirely useless and very unsightly object in the court of the Gentiles," is beneath criticism, and unworthy of serious refutation. Great as is the homage which is paid by men to money, Dr Barclay will surely stand alone in thinking that, because this cave of the Sakhrah was "a safe depository for treasure," it became to Jew, Christian, and Mohammedan, an object of profound interest and reverence.

In the present state of our knowledge, therefore, we favour the view commonly held, and ably vindicated by Pierotti, Bartlett, and others, namely, that this rock is the summit of Mount Moriah, beside which was the threshing-floor of Araunah, on which David, by *express divine injunction*, erected an altar unto the Lord, and where the Lord answered him from heaven by fire upon the altar of burnt-offering; where, also, Solomon afterwards placed the great brazen altar of burnt-offering in front of the naos, or holy house. Those who object to this view, are bound to explain why this rock was left in its natural rough state amid the splendour of the temple. It will be remembered that the altar was to be of unhewn stone, and not reached by steps. The brazen structure of Solomon could only therefore be an ornamental casing for the rock, whose upper surface no tool had, nor has yet, touched. The shape of the Sakhrah quite adapts it for this purpose; and it has a regular slope on the south side leading up to the higher part, which, according to rabbinical tradition, was the position of the inclined ascent. The rock is large enough to suit the size of the brazen altar, which was to be 30 feet square. We must content ourselves with remarking, that such a history sufficiently explains the veneration which has centred on this famous but mysterious spot, and with referring to Pierotti and

Bartlett for detailed proof that, on this view of the case, the rock satisfies all the requisite conditions.

Keeping in view the true place of the ravine already spoken of, namely, to the north of the temple, many of the positions for which Mr Sandie contends, in his scholarly book, with much skill and ability, are in perfect harmony with our topographical creed, which isolates the temple hill, surrounds it with a ravine,—at least on three sides,—and perfectly accords with the statements of the Jewish historian. We do not concur with Mr Sandie in his location of Acra and Zion ; but we agree with him in thinking that Calvary must have been in the vicinity of Antonia, beside some thoroughfare leading out of the city into the country, and probably in the valley of the Kedron.

When the reader enters on the perusal of the bulky octavo called "*The City of the Great King*, by J. T. Barclay, M.D., *Missionary*," he has some reason for doing so with high expectations. He is told in the garrulous preface that the author has been engaged in "kindred studies" for more than twenty years ; yet, after a three years' residence in Jerusalem to boot, he had no thought of publishing until, as he informs us, providential circumstances occurred which "gave him opportunities and facilities for research and observation possessed by no one in modern times"! He was called to give his medical services to the Effendi, who was sent as architect to Jerusalem by the Sultan ; and as he fortunately succeeded in relieving this Turkish functionary of some disagreeable complaint, the Effendi petitioned the Mejlis or Congress of Jerusalem for liberty to associate his medical adviser with himself in designing the proposed repairs, alterations, and decorations of the Mosque of Omar (or Kubbet es Sakhras). In this Dr Barclay frankly allows that the Effendi was actuated, not so much by gratitude for his skilful services, nor by a high appreciation of his "technic abilities"—much as he valued them—as by the desire to take advantage of some philosophical instruments which Dr B. had in his possession! The Effendi's request being granted, the American Hakeem, in the novel capacity of architect, enjoyed free access to every part of the Haram area and "other holy places which have been seen by no Christian eye since the chivalric but unenlightened period of Frank domination." And now he felt himself called upon to give the "important and interesting information" to the world of which his "laborious investigations" had put him in possession. We allow that Dr B. appears to have availed himself of his access to holy places, and of his other means of acquiring information, with enthusiasm and diligence ; but, as we accompany him, we desiderate in him at every step the qualifications which mark the true archæologist and topographer. Of confident

hypothesis and dogmatical assertion there is no lack in this volume ; but we wish for evidence where we have only oracular averments and unsupported opinions. The historical statements are often untrustworthy ; nor are the author's materials, such as they are, disposed in a simple and natural way. On the contrary, they are brought together in a confused mass, bidding defiance to all the rules of correct classification and arrangement, although, from the titles of the chapters, one would, at the first glance, suppose it to be otherwise. The style, too, is vulgar and impure ; and its inaccuracies must often offend the taste of a scholarly reader. A few specimens of inaccuracy, out of many more which we have noted, will shew that we do not wantonly prefer this grave charge. Among the classic beauties of the performance, we find *tessara* for *tesserae* ; " *cujus animam regnit,*" for *regnat* ; " *pro dolor,*" for *proh dolor* ! " *clauditer*" for *clauditur* ; " *monasterium de valle Josephat,*" for *de vallis* ; " *Piscina gemilares,*" for *gemellorum* ; " *locus patriarchi,*" for *patriarchæ* ; " *Ecclesiae St. Pelagii, St. Petri, St. Johannis,*" for *Sti. Pelagii, &c.* " *Domus templi sen officiane Fratrum militæ Templi,*" for *officina fratrum militiæ, &c.* We have such phrases as "this late *Anno Domini*;" and "the *esquiline character*" of one of the gates of ancient Jerusalem (the dung gate), when the word should have been (if the author had any idea in his head at all) *sterquilinarian*. Pages could be filled with the colloquialisms and the Americanisms which disfigure the book.

Dr B. speaks of the "accuracy of his maps and other adjuvant illustrations." Concerning his map of the city which, we suppose, is published separately, he affirms, quite characteristically, that "nothing is hazarded in saying that it is the only correct one in existence." If it resemble the plans which belong to this work, this is a statement which only proves how highly the author, in making it, estimated the gullibility of the public. The map of ancient Jerusalem is wretched in execution, and entirely without authority in many of its details. That of Jerusalem under the Crusaders is, on Tobler's testimony, taken from him without acknowledgment, while it pretends to be original. The bird's-eye view of modern Jerusalem has little merit. For some of the best plates, Dr B. is indebted to Bartlett and Williams, whom he has not the grace to mention. In one particular, he shews considerable skill. We refer to his swelling the dimensions of his book by the wholesale importation of large portions of other works, to the extent sometimes of many pages. Will it be believed that in one place about thirty pages are occupied by continuous extracts from *Aristeas*, *Tacitus*, and *Josephus* : while in another part not less than seventy consecutive pages are occupied by

extracts from Arculf, Willibard, Procter's Chronology of the Crusades, Mejr Ed Din Saewulf, Benjamin of Tudela, the Norman Chronicler, and others ! Indeed, our author cannot inform us that, by way of an innocent compromise with Mohammedan notions, he voluntarily submitted, before entering the Haram, to what he styles "the rubbing, scrubbing, bumping, thumping, racking, cracking operation of the Turkish bath," without dragging in a lengthened quotation of some six pages, descriptive of this process, which, though ludicrous, is not worthy of a place even in the columns of a Mississippi provincial newspaper, and is inserted here with singularly bad taste. We wonder not that when the explorer of "The City of the Great King" was sending such material to the printer, the publishers—as the former innocently relates—gave him to understand, "to his extreme regret," that "the volume, having already transcended its prescribed limits, must speedily close."

We know not whether this volume be one of that class of works on Palestine, referred to by the author, "of whose remunerative circulation there is not even a beginning." But we are sure, after having looked through it as continuously as the fatiguing nature of the occupation would allow, that it is one of that class, of the making of which there need be "no end ;" for there is, of course, as little difficulty as merit in re-printing what other men have written. It is with regret we say this of a book which, with all its blunders and blemishes, contains some contributions of permanent value to our knowledge of Jerusalem, by a man who, with strongly-marked transatlantic angularities, is, we doubt not, personally upright and estimable.

W. T.

P.S.—Since the foregoing article was in type, we learn that Lieutenant Warren has been prosecuting his researches at the west wall of the Haram. He has found that the pavement to the east of the pier of "Robinson's Arch," referred to in p. 296, stretches to the temple wall, and that the huge stones of the arch lie huddled together upon it, just as they fell, probably, at the siege by Titus. The depth of the gully below this pavement is probably not less than 60 feet ; and it is therefore likely that beneath it there is another arch, under which a stream may be found flowing. It is now regarded as not improbable that the ravine of the Tyropœon will be found to have bent round to the east, cutting off the temple mount from Ophel, and isolating it on the south, as well as on the other sides. He is, while we write, engaged in explorations intended to settle these questions.

The entire arch, which springs out of the temple wall 500 feet to the north of "Robinson's," is now ascertained to be one

of a series of arches which supported another viaduct. Other four arches have been found standing to the west of this massive arch. They decrease in height as they go westward, and terminate in an arched passage or tunnel, 10 feet wide, which has been traced to a point 230 feet west of the temple wall. The arches of this tunnel are built upon others, which are supposed to have been used as tanks belonging to an immense and complicated system of reservoirs, passages, and aqueducts, which Mr Warren is endeavouring to unravel.

At a point 350 feet from the south wall, he has, by sinking a shaft through Ophel, come upon the continuation of the passage to which the "bottomless pit" led, at the foot of the deep excavation near the south-west corner of the Haram. At this point it still runs on southward. The interest of the work increases at every step, and the Christian world will surely not allow investigations so important to be abandoned for want of funds.

ART. V.—*Mill's Reply to His Critics.*

IN reading lately the *Memoir, Letters, and Remains* of Alexis De Tocqueville, who has speculated so profoundly on the causes and consequences of national character, I was much struck with the following :—

"The ages in which metaphysics have been most cultivated, have in general been those in which men have been most raised above themselves. Indeed, though I care little for the study, I have always been struck by the influence which it has exercised over the things which seem least connected with it, and even over society in general. I do not think that any statesmen ought to be indifferent as to whether the prevailing metaphysical opinions be materialistic or not. Condillac, I have no doubt, drove many people into materialism, who had never read his book ; for abstract ideas, relating to human nature, penetrate at last, I know not how, into public morals."

Had De Tocqueville's studies run in that direction, it would not have been difficult for him to unfold the causes of the phenomena which he has so carefully noted. These phenomena are three in number. First, a taste for philosophic speculation is a mark of an elevated age. It is the sign of a time which believes that there is as much above the surface of the earth, and beneath it, as there is on it ; and is seeking successfully

or unsuccessfully to gauge the height of the heavens, in order to draw down influences from it; or to penetrate the ground, in the hope of discovering mines from which unseen wealth may be dug. The age which comprised Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle, in Greece; the age of Cicero in Rome; the seventeenth century in France, England, and Holland; the last part of the eighteenth and the first part of the nineteenth centuries in Scotland and in Germany, have been the peculiarly philosophic ages of these countries, and have been the times of deepest and brightest thought in all departments of literature and science. Whatever may be said against the age in which we live, it is clear that it is one in which the deepest speculative questions are discussed; and it is characterised by high literary attainment and boundless scientific and political enthusiasm. The second fact noticed is, that metaphysics exercise a mighty influence on the things least connected with them, in fact over society in general. This can be accounted for. Men's deep and abiding convictions,—religious, ethical, and philosophic,—when they have such, or the restlessness gendered in hearts emptied of all credences, and with pretended satisfactions rushing in on every side to fill the vacuum, exert a far greater power over them and their age, than outward circumstances or floating impulses. De Tocqueville recommends statesmen carefully to watch the philosophy of their day, which is always sowing seed to produce fruit for good or for evil in the age that follows. I may add that the friends of religion should also guard those springs out of which the streams of action flow. For De Tocqueville tells us, thirdly, that a materialistic philosophy penetrates into public, and I may add private, morals; and this among persons who never looked into a work on metaphysics. He refers specially to the Sensational philosophy of France, which exercised so fatal an influence on French character and politics, in the latter half of last century, giving a direction to public sentiment which culminated in the mad excesses of the French Revolution, and then sank into the stagnant indifference of the first Empire. When we look from this point, we see that we have dark days and fearful conflicts before us in France and in England: for we have a prevailing philosophy of quite as earthward a character and tendency as that of Condillac and the Encyclopædists; with qualities fitted to stimulate a wild enthusiasm; entertained by earnest and able men eager to propagate their opinions, supporting each other in important literary organs, and at the present moment buoyed up by the hopes of victory. Happily we have in this country (it is different, I fear, under the new Empire in France), many forces—unfortunately unconnected and distracted—to meet this, both in the high-toned philosophy which still lingers among us, and in a

fervent religion widely spread, and fitted, I think, to keep the materialistic psychology from attaining to so great a sway as it reached in last century, and may still reach in this, on the continent. But the contest in England is a very serious one—the religious public being quite unaware of its importance, and not likely to be aroused till they see the practical effects, when it is too late to avert them. Thinking men, however, feel that they have a part to act in this crisis. I am to introduce my readers to one of the skirmishes of the great warfare.

When Mr Mill published, in the summer of 1865, his *Examination of Sir W. Hamilton's Philosophy*, it was received with a shout of exultation by a considerable portion of the English press. I happen to know that some of the articles were written by young men, who began to study with the view of entering the church, but who were tempted aside by the spirit prevailing in the Universities, and are now on the London press, ready to attack on every occasion the old faith of the country. The only one of the laudatory criticisms likely to live, is the one by Mr Grote in the *Westminster Review*, and it will survive by reason of the eminence of the writer, rather than any very marked excellence of its own. The older and graver portions of the press sought to resist the tide. In January 1866, appeared an article in *Blackwood*, examining with care Mill's theory of the genesis of our idea of an external world. The *Edinburgh* laboured at a later date to meet some of Mill's positions. Dr Mansel, early in 1866, defended Sir W. Hamilton's doctrine of the conditioned, and his own applications of it, in acute and elaborate articles in the *Contemporary*. Dr H. B. Smith, in the *American Presbyterian and Theological Review* of the same date, undermined with great ability the fundamental principles of Mill's philosophy. Dr Calderwood, in April and July, submitted the sensational character of the philosophy to a rigid examination in this journal. There is an elaborate criticism in the *North American Review* for July of that year. In October, Mr Guy, a priest of the Church of Rome, offered important strictures in an article in the *Dublin Review*. Mr F. P. Mahaffy of Trinity College, Dublin, representing a very different interest, has, in his introduction to a translation of Kuno Fischer's *Commentary on Kant*, examined, from the standpoint of Kant, Mr Mill's doctrine of Permanent Possibilities and Necessary Truth.

Contemporaneous with these have been notices of a more favourable, though not at all of a thoroughly approving character. Professor Masson, it so happened, had been delivering at the British Institution, a course of lectures on *Recent British Philosophy*, and in these Sir W. Hamilton was the hero. Meanwhile, Mr Mill's *Examination* came out, and the Professor

in publishing his lectures, which, as a whole, are a sort of reflex of what the London literary men thought of metaphysicians in the year 1865, added an appendix commenting on Mill, full of laudations, as might be expected of such a hero worshipper, but endeavouring to meet some of his positions. Mr Herbert Spencer, though belonging substantially to the same school, wrote an article in the *Fortnightly* for July 1865, on the points in which Mill and he came into collision. Professor Fraser, the successor of Hamilton in the chair of Logic and Metaphysics in Edinburgh, in a long and elaborate review in the *North British*, thinks that Mill has not always understood Hamilton properly, but openly abandons two of the principles which Hamilton spent his life in defending,—our immediate knowledge of an external world and necessary truth; and retreats to an idealism nearly allied to that of Berkeley, and falls back on a faith of which he gives no clear account, and which I suspect would not long stand before the assaults of the sceptic. It is ominous that Mr Mill compliments him “as on the substantive doctrines principally concerned, a most valuable ally, to whom I might almost have left the defence of our common opinions.”

Meanwhile, separate works have appeared in answer to Mill. There is the *Battle of the Two Philosophies*, by an *Inquirer*, written very much from the stand-point of Hamilton; Mr H. F. O. Hanlon's acute criticism of *John Stuart Mill's Pure Idealism*, and an attempt to shew that if logically carried out it is pure nihilism; confined to one subject—M. P. Proctor Alexander, *The Examination of Mr J. Stuart Mill's Doctrine of Causation in relation to Moral Freedom*; and we may add a work not noticed by Mr Mill, *Mr J. S. Mill's Psychological Theory*, by a *Philosophical Conservative* (Mr Bleek).

I do not intend to comment on these articles and treatises. I would advise book collectors to get hold of them as long as they are to be had. They constitute a unique portion of the literature of the last two or three years. I have only one remark to make on them. I am not satisfied that Hamilton's pupils and disciples have given a defence of him, such as might have been expected of them. True, on one point, the philosophy of the conditioned, Dr Mansel has furnished a full reply, and those who wish to know Hamilton's philosophy, will always resort to these articles. But, otherwise, and on other points, the defence of Hamilton has been meagre and unsatisfactory. It is well known, indeed, to those who take an interest in these discussions, that I look on some of Hamilton's principal positions as untenable. I am convinced that he never did nor could reconcile what he took from Kant, with

what he retained from Reid ; that there was an utter incongruity between Kant's forms and Reid's common sense, though both were received by him ; that his doctrine of realism was not consistent with his doctrine of relativity ; and that he erred in identifying the *phenomena* of Kant with the *qualities* of the Scottish school. I am not satisfied that he has brought out all that is in the mind's idea and conviction in regard to the infinite ; I predicted that his doctrine of the relativity of knowledge would issue logically in a philosophy of nescience ; I hold that his constant appeals to consciousness are loose and illegitimate ; that he threw us back on an undefined faith in an unsatisfactory manner ; that his view of the relations which the mind can discover is narrow ; that he never understood what is the precise nature of what he calls the regulative faculty ; and that his theory of unconscious mental operations cannot stand a sifting investigation. Still, I do not believe that Hamilton has been guilty of all the monstrous inconsistencies and contradictions which have been attributed to him by his unsparing opponent. I cherish the hope that there will appear some pupil who feels it to be a sacred duty to defend his master, not alive to fight for himself, from charges which I am convinced could be met by one who has entered thoroughly into the spirit of his philosophy.

But I am in this article to restrict myself to a defined field. In the third edition of his work, Mr Mill replies to his critics. Dr Mansel has lately furnished a counter reply in the *Contemporary*. I am obliged to the editor of the *British and Foreign Evangelical Review*, for opening his pages to my defence. It is hoped that it may not be without its interest in the eyes of those who have a taste for such discussions, or who know how important the issues involved, and are aware that the new philosophy is to be met, not by empty declamation, but by argument. The combatants are now brought to very close quarters. We now see clearly what are the questions at issue. This article may thus form a sort of *résumé* of the whole controversy, not so far as it relates to Hamilton, but so far as it bears on what is more important, the fundamental truth which Mr Mill has assailed.

I require before entering on the discussion, to refer to one or two personal matters, these fortunately not involving any offensive personal feeling. I had spoken of Hobbes, Hartley, Hume, and Brown as Mr Mill's philosophic ancestors, and of Mr James Mill and M. Comte as having had influence on the young thinker, and of M. Comte as having led him to regard it as "impossible for the mind to rise to first or final causes, or to know the nature of things" (*Examination of Mill's Philosophy*, p. 8). I did so, because M. Comte, the great defender of that

doctrine, had expounded his views before Mr Mill had published anything. But Mr Mill tells us : " The larger half of my *System of Logic*, including all its fundamental doctrines, was written before I had seen the ' *Le Cours de Philosophie Positive*.' That work was indebted to M. Comte for many valuable thoughts, but a short list would exhaust the chapters, and even the pages which contain them " (p. 267). I suppose he means to include not merely his *System of Logic*, but the fuller exposition which we have in some of his other works, in which he has expounded doctrines identical with those held by M. Comte, and usually fathered upon him. He assures us, however, in regard to the general doctrine of Nescience, as I call it, he was familiar with it " before I was out of my boyhood, from the teachings of my father. Ever since the days of Hume that doctrine has been the general property of the philosophic world. From the time of Brown it has entered into popular philosophy." This statement does not differ essentially from mine, only it ascribes less to M. Comte and more to Mr James Mill, who is represented as teaching the doctrine to his son from boyhood. I leave this statement without comment, except that I must protest against representing Brown, who argued for the existence of God from the traces of design, as discarding either first or final causes.

Mr Mill admits (p. 319) " Dr M'Cosh's work is unimpeachable in respect of candour and fairness." I accept the compliment. I did intend to act fairly towards my distinguished opponent ; and carefully abstained from quibbling and captiousness, when strongly tempted to indulge in it by what seemed the severe criticism of Mr Hamilton. Esteeming moral higher than intellectual qualities (so deified by Buckle and others of the school), I value this testimony higher than I would have done a laudation of my abilities. But the compliment is followed by a charge, that " he cannot be relied on for correctly apprehending the maxims and tendencies of a philosophy different from his own," and he complains that " he has not been able, even a little way, into the mode of thought he is combating " (p. 250). All I have to say here is, that if I have not been able to do so, it must be owing to some hebetude of intellect ; for I was reared in favourable circumstances for understanding the system and its tendencies. Albeit some years younger than Mr Mill, I was brought up intellectually in a position not so widely different from those in which he was trained. The first professor of mental science who impressed me favourably, which he did by his cool intellectual power, was Mr James Mylne, of Glasgow University, who, following Destutt de Tracey, derived all our ideas from sensation, memory, and judgment. The first metaphysical work I read with

admiration, was the *Lectures* of Thomas Brown. At a prematurely early age, I had perused the philosophic works of Hume. I read James Mill's *Analysis* at the time it came out, and also Sir James Mackintosh's *Dissertation*, in which he attempts to resolve conscience into the association of ideas. I all along, indeed, had a suspicion that the refined analysis of these writers was far too subtle, and that they must be overlooking some of the deepest and most characteristic phenomena of the mind. Still, these were the men for whom, in my juvenile years, I had an admiration, rather than towards Reid, or even Stewart or Locke; and I believe I entered a good way into their modes of thought and their systems. But on mature and independent reflection, I had found my way out of their subtleties, and this before I knew anything of Hamilton, who turned the tide in public sentiment. At a time when the *Philosophie Positive* was known to few in this country, I read it with care, and I saw at once that it would come to be a power in this century, quite equal to Hobbes in the seventeenth and of Hume in the eighteenth centuries; and I noticed it in my first published work (*Method of Divine Government*, B. II. c. ii., Note D). On my first reading Mill's *Logic*, which was not for some time after its publication, I saw that the philosophy in which I had been brought up was involved throughout. The literary work on which I was engaged at the time when Mill's *Examination of Hamilton* came out, was an expository and critical account of Hume's philosophy for this *Review*, and intended to find a place in a contemplated work on the Scottish philosophy; and the book came out in time to enable me to bring out in a set of footnotes, the curious correspondence between the philosophy of Hume and that of Mill. I mention these things, to shew that I should be quite prepared to enter a considerable way into Mr Mill's mode of thought. But by painful cogitation I had wrought myself out of it, and believed I had discovered the fundamental fallacies of the whole philosophy. The one qualification which I possessed for the task of examining Mr Mill, lay in my having been trained in much the same school, and having risen above it; and I thought it right to give to the world, with an application to the very able work which appeared, the arguments which had convinced myself, and which I had expounded for years to my college classes.

Mr Mill is often alleging against those who oppose him, that they are not able to place themselves "at the point of view of a theory different" from their own. But has Mr Mill never put to himself the question, "May I not have fallen into the sin I have laid to the charge of my opponents? Have I ever thoroughly entered into and sympathised with that high-

souled philosophy which was introduced by Plato, which was continued by men like Augustine, Anselm, Descartes, Cudworth, Leibnitz, Jacobi, and Kant, and Cousin ; and in a lower key, by Aristotle, Buffier, Reid, Stewart, and Hamilton ?” I admire greatly the ability, dialectic and deductive, of Mr Mill. It is peculiarly a clear, a penetrating understanding ; but it is not distinguished by wide sympathies and philosophic comprehensiveness. He does admire Plato and Coleridge ; but it is because the former had so much of the search-spirit and the undermining dialectic ; and because the latter was dissolving the old philosophy and theology of Britain. I am convinced that he has seen so many contradictions in Hamilton, because he could not always take into view the full sweep of his massive, but at times ill-constructed system. When he commends an opponent, as he does Hamilton often and Mansel at times, it is when he sees they are travelling towards the point which he himself has reached. It is surely conceivable that he may have been so filled with his own system, inherited from a beloved father, and cherished resolutely at the time when the tide was all against him, and that it may now bulk so largely before his eyes, as to make him to some extent incapable of appreciating, or even thoroughly comprehending, those who look on things from a different point of view.

I do believe that because of my philosophic experience, I am able, at least, to look at both sides of the question. I claim to understand the “maxims” of this philosophy—except, indeed that I confess to a difficulty in apprehending how on his principles, he reaches the idea of extension, or a reasonable conviction of the existence of his fellow men. Possibly I may be able to judge of the “tendencies” of it as coolly and unpar- tially as those who have constructed it. He has himself characterised the Sensational philosophy of France, as “the shallowest set of doctrines which were ever passed off upon a cultivated age as a complete psychological system, the ideology of Condillac and his school ; a system which affected to resolve all the phenomena of the human mind into sensation, by a process which essentially consisted in merely *calling* all states of mind however heterogeneous by that name” (*Discuss.* Vol. I. p. 410). But Condillac, as a philosophic thinker, a scholar, and a writer, was equal to Mr Mill, and was quite as acute in arguing against Descartes and Malebranche, as Mill is against Whewell and Hamilton, and had much the same kind of influence in France a hundred years ago, that Mr Mill is now exercising in England. I am convinced that Condillac had no idea that any evil consequences would follow from his philosophic theories. Most of his works were written for the purpose of training a prince of Parma ; he believes that there is a God ; “that the

laws which reason prescribes to us are the laws which God ~~has~~ imposed on us: and that it is here that the morality of actions is completed. There is, therefore, a natural law; that is to say, a law which has its foundation on the will of God" (*Traité des Animeux*, c. vii). I admit that the two systems, that of Condillac and that of Mill, are not the same; but it could be shewn that they have a much closer correspondence in themselves, and in their logical and practical consequences, than Mr Mill will be disposed to allow. Both derive our ideas from sensation, but Mr Mill takes credit for adding association, and says we get our ideas from sensation by association. But it can be shown that Condillac had not overlooked association. I find Dugald Stewart remarking, "Condillac's earliest work appeared three years before the publication of 'Hartley's Theory.' It is entitled, '*Essai sur l'Origine des Connaissances Humaine, Ouvrage où l'on réduit à une seul principe tout ce qui concerne l'entendement humain.*' This *seul principe* is the association of ideas. The account which both authors give of the transformation of sensations into ideas is substantially the same" (*Dissert.*, P. ii., S. 6). But the truth is, both had been anticipated by Hutcheson, who had expounded the general doctrine, and by Hume, who had used the doctrine of associations to account for beliefs supposed to be innate. Certain it is, that Condillac speaks of association of ideas which are the effect of a foreign impression, "Celles-la sont souvent si bien cimentees, qu'il nous est impossible de les detruire." "En général les impressions que nous éprouvons dans différentes circonstances nous font lier des idées que nous ne sommes plus maîtres de séparer." Mr Mill, will, I believe, be astonished to find here his father's law of Inseparable Association. Not only so, but he accounts by this law, like Mr Mill, for what is supposed to be *inné ou naturel* (see "Connaissances Hum.," c. ix). I doubt much whether Mr Mill is entitled to assume such airs in denouncing the sensational school of France. His ideas, generated out of sensation by association, do not differ so widely after all from the "transformed sensations" of Condillac. Both philosophies, when we trace them sufficiently far down, are found to rest on nothing more solid than sensations with their associations,—only Mr Mill is driven at times to bring in something inexplicable, of which nothing can be known. Let Mr Mill's philosophy have as long time to work as that of Condillac had, from the middle of last century to the French Revolution, and through the imperial sway of Bonaparte, and I believe that "sensation *plus* association" will not be found to have any more elevating effect on prevailing thought and sentiment than "transformed sensations" had—only I cherish the hope that in this country the tendency will

be counteracted by the higher philosophy and theology still abiding among us.

It falls in with the order of my examination to begin with his account of mind, which he had resolved into "a series of feelings with a back-ground of possibilities of feeling," requiring the farther statement that it is "a series aware of itself as past and future." He had acknowledged that this "reduces us to the alternative of believing that the Mind, or Ego, is something different from any series of feelings or possibilities of them, or of accepting the paradox that something which, *ex hypothesi*, is but a series of feelings, can be aware of itself as a series ;" that his theory on this subject has "intrinsic difficulties, and that he is here face to face with a final inexplicability." He has told us (*Logic*, III. iv. 1), that "the question, What are the laws of nature? may be stated thus:—what are the fewest and simplest assumptions which, being granted, the whole existing order of nature would result?" Now I believe that the single and simple assumption to be made on this subject is, that in every conscious act there is a knowledge of self as acting, and in every remembrance of a past experience of self, as having had the experience. Here we are face to face with a final fact, which needs no explicability. But Mr Mill will not state it thus, and he is flitting round and round the point without alighting on it. He affirms that there "is no ground for believing that the Ego is an original presentation of consciousness." Now I admit that an abstract Ego is not given in self-consciousness; but the concrete Ego is—that is, the Ego as thinking, feeling, or in some other act. He allows, in his new edition, that he does not profess to have adequately accounted for the belief in mind." Let us see how he seeks to bear up his theory in the Appendix which he has added:—

"The fact of recognising a sensation, of being reminded of it, and, as we say, remembering that it has been felt before, is the simplest and most elementary fact of memory; and the inexplicable tie or law, the organic union (as Professor Masson calls it), which connects the present consciousness with the past one, of which it reminds me, is as near, I think, as we can get to a positive conception of Self. That there is something real in this tie, real as the sensations themselves, and not a mere product of the laws of thought, without any fact corresponding to it, I hold to be undubitable." "Whether we are directly conscious of it in the act of remembrance, as we are of succession in the fact of having successive sensations, or whether, according to the opinion of Kant, we are not conscious of self at all, but are compelled to assume it as a necessary condition of memory, I do not undertake to decide. But this original element, which has no community of nature with any of the things answering to our names, and to which we cannot give any name but its own peculiar one without implying

some false or ungrounded theory, is the Ego or Self. As such, I ascribe a reality to the Ego—to my own mind—different from that real existence as a Permanent Possibility, which is the only reality I acknowledge in matter.” “We are forced to apprehend every part of the series as linked with the other parts by something in common, which is not the feelings themselves, any more than the succession of the feelings is the feelings themselves; and as that which is the same in the first as in the second, in the second as in the third, in the third as in the fourth, and so on, must be the same in the first and in the fiftieth, this common element is a permanent element. But beyond this, we can affirm nothing of it except the states of consciousness themselves.”—(Pp. 256, 257.)

There are plenty of assumptions and admissions in this passage, far more than the defender of intuitive psychology is obliged to make. There is an “original element,” to which he ascribes a “reality,” and a real existence; a “permanent element,” something common to the feelings, “which is not the feelings themselves”; the same in the first and fiftieth state of consciousness, and to which we can give no other name than the Ego, or Self. Now what is this but the permanent mind or Ego of the metaphysicians, with its various modifications, revealed by consciousness? I certainly do not stand up for the doctrine of Kant, according to whom we are not conscious of self, but are required to assume it as a condition. I prefer a much simpler doctrine,—that we are conscious of self in every mental act, conscious of self grieving in every feeling of grief, of self remembering in every act of memory. Admit this clearly and frankly, and I am satisfied. But I am satisfied because in this we have two great truths—that man knows, and that he knows real existence, that is, self, as existing. But the disciple of the doctrine of Nescience—that is, of the doctrine that we can know nothing of the nature of things—ever draws back from such a plain statement, as inconsistent with his favourite theory; and he talks instead of an “inexplicable tie,” or “law,” or “organic union,” or “link to connect the facts,”—language which is metaphorical at the best, and never does express the fact, which is a very simple one, though full of meaning.

We are here at the place where Mr Mill is in greatest difficulties, and feels himself to be so. He tells us that “the one fact which the Psychological Theory cannot explain, is the fact of Memory (for Expectation I hold to be, psychologically and logically, a consequence of Memory).” I have shewn, I think, that he is for ever assuming, without perceiving it, other primordial facts; and that there are other facts equally entitled to be regarded as primordial, and, on the same ground, “no reason can be given for it which does not presuppose the belief, and assume it to be well-grounded.” But let us specially in-

quire, What is involved in the assumption of memory? I had objected that Mr Mill was not able to give an account of the genesis of the idea which, as consciousness attests, we have of Time. Let us look at the account he now gives of the idea (p. 247), and then we shall be prepared to look at the way in which he generates it. He tells us that by Time is to be "understood an indefinite succession of successions." This does not make the matter clearer; the more so, as he has no things to succeed each other except sensations, which are only for the moment. "The only ultimate facts or primitive elements in Time are Before and After, which (the knowledge of opposites being one) involve the notion of Neither before nor after—*i.e.*, simultaneous." I do not look on this account as a correct one of the facts of our experience. We get the idea of Time as a primitive fact in memory: we remember every event as happening in time past, and can then abstract the time from the event. I certainly do not give in to the principle that "the knowledge of opposites is one," for I hold that the knowledge of opposites is the knowledge of opposites—that is, of things opposed; and I do not allow that Before and After are opposites—they are rather continuous. But we are more interested to inquire, What account does he give of our idea and conviction as to this infinite Succession of Successions—this Before, and After, and Simultaneous? His answering is hesitating, and it is unsatisfactory. It brings out the weak points of the theory, and the awkwardness of the attempt made to bolster it up. He admits, "I have never pretended to account by association for the idea of Time." "Neither do I decide whether that inseparable attribute of our sensations is annexed to them by the laws of the mind or given in the sensations; nor whether, at this great height of abstraction, the distinction does not disappear." He admits that Time is the inseparable attribute of our sensations. He admits that we have the idea. We ask, Whence it comes? Let us look at the alternatives between which he hesitates. Our idea of Time "may be given in the sensations themselves." Observe how he is giving to the sensations a new and a totally diverse element, in the very manner of the school of Condillac. An idea implying indefinite successiveness—a Before and an After—all given in sensations, which we thought were confined to the present!! Surely this beats anything found in the "shallowest set of doctrines ever passed off upon a cultivated age," and "which consisted in merely *calling* all states of mind, however heterogeneous, by that name,"—that is, the name of sensations. If he take the other alternative, then he is giving to the mind the power of generating in the course of its exercise, a totally new idea—a view utterly inconsistent with his own empirical theory, and the very view of Leibnitz, who makes *intellectus ipse* a

source of ideas. No wonder that he seems unwilling to be fixed on either horn, and would fain mount up into some height of abstraction, where the distinction may disappear. But the facts do not lie in any great height of abstraction, but in the low level of our every-day consciousness, and can be expressed only by giving sensation its proper place, and time its proper place, both being equally primordial facts.

I now come to a more perplexing subject, in which I admit there is room for difference of opinion, though no room for that of Mr Mill—that is, the idea and the conviction which we have in regard to Body. As the conclusion of his subtle disquisitions, he had defined Matter as the Permanent Possibility of Sensation. In the added Appendix, he declares clearly that there is no proof that we perceive it by our senses, or that the notion and belief of it come to us by an original law of our nature; and that “all we are conscious of, may be accounted for without supposing that we perceive Matter by our senses, and that the notion and belief may have come to us by the laws of our constitution, without being a revelation of any objective reality.”

He admits (p. 245) that his opponents have referred his theory to the right test, in aiming to shew that “its attempt to account for the belief in matter implies or requires that the belief should always exist as a condition of its own production. The objection is true if conclusive.” But he adds, “they are not very particular about the proof of its truth; they one and all think their case made out, if I employ in any part of the exposition the language of common life.” I deny for myself that I have tried to make out my case by such an argument. I have indeed expressed a wish that he would “employ language consistent with his theory, and we should then be in a position to judge whether he is building it up fairly. I believe that any plausibility possessed by it is derived from his expressing it in common language, which enables him to introduce, surreptitiously and unconsciously, the ideas wrapt up in it. When he and Mr Bain speak of “a sweep of the arm,” and “a movement of the eye,” it is difficult for others, perhaps even for themselves, to think of the arm and the eye as a mere momentary sensations, as unextended, and as not moving in space. I was convinced that if the theory were only expressed in language not implying extension in the original sensation, its insufficiency would at once be seen. He has now, in a long appendix, laboured to construct his theory in language consistent with it, and the baldness of it at once appears.

My objection proceeded on a far deeper principle than the language employed by Mr Mill. I appealed to consciousness, not as Hamilton would have done, to settle the whole question

at once, but to testify to a matter of fact, which Mr Mill would admit to fall immediately under its cognisance. Consciousness declares that we have now an idea of something extended—extended on three dimensions, length, breadth, and depth, and, I may add, of extended objects moving in space. It is admitted, then, that we have this idea, and I defy Mr Mill to revolve this idea into any element allowed by him, in fact into any element not involving extension. He tells us that the whole variety of the facts of nature, as we know it, is given in the mere existence of our sensations, and in the laws or order of their succession. But from which of these does he get extension? Surely not from mere sensation, which, as not being extended, cannot give what it does not possess. As certainly not from laws or order in successive sensations, which, as they do not possess it individually, cannot have it in their cumulation, any more than an addition of zeros could give us a positive number. We have one more primordial fact, not only not accounted for by his theory, but utterly inconsistent with it.

We must examine his account of matter a little more narrowly. It is a possibility of sensations. Whence this dark background of possibilities which he cannot get rid of, which he cannot get behind, to which, indeed, he cannot get up? To account for the phenomena, he says, they come in groups, and by rigid laws of causation. Whence these co-existing groups and unvariable successions? Do they come in obedience to mental laws, say, to the laws of association? These laws are represented by him as being contiguity and resemblance. Do these create the groups and successions? I scarcely think that Mr Mill will assert that they do. I remember when travelling in the midst of a group of sensations called the Alps, thinking only of my wretchedly wet condition, I was suddenly startled by a group and succession of sensations such as I had never experienced before, and which I referred to an avalanche falling a mile off. Whence this effect? It was not produced by any volition of mine. Surely Mr Mill will not argue that it was produced by contiguity or resemblance, or any of the known laws of association. Whence, then? If he says something within me, then I say we have here a set of laws of a very curious and complex character, unnoticed by the theorist. But it can be shewn that the facts cannot be explained by laws within me. The law of cause and effect is, that the same co-existing agencies are followed by the same consequences. But I might be under the same group of sensations as I was when the avalanche fell, without the sounds which I heard following. Does not this require us to posit something out of the series of sensations to account

for the phenomena in the series ; and this something obeying laws independent altogether of our sensations and associations. If we once posit such an external, extra serial, agency, we cannot withdraw it when it becomes inconvenient ; we must go on with it, we must inquire into all that is involved in it by the laws of induction. This was the argument that convinced Brown—who, however, called in to guarantee it an intuitive conviction of cause and effect—that there must be an external world. Whether the argument is convincing, on the supposition that the belief in causation is not intuitive, I will not take it upon myself to say. I am not sure that the infant mind could arrive, in the midst of such complications, at a knowledge of the law of cause and effect. Finding many sensations not following from any law in the mind, it could not, I believe, reach a law of invariable succession. But then, it is said, it would refer them to something out of the mind. But with an experience only of something *in the mind*, how could it argue anything *out of the mind*, of which outness it has as yet no idea in the sensations or order of sensations? Would it not, in fact, be shut up in the shell of the Ego, and find in that Ego most of its sensations without a cause? Or rather would not an infant mind, endowed with only the powers allowed by Mr Mill, speedily become extinguished? But if it could live, and discover the law of cause and effect. as Mr Mill thinks, that law seems to require us to believe in an external something, obeying laws of co-existence and succession independent of the series of sensations, and we should have to take this with all its logical consequences. This gives us Matter not as a possibility of sensations, but an external something obeying laws of co-existence and succession, and the cause of sensations in us.

The theory would, after all, be utterly inadequate, for it would not account for the most prominent thing in our conception of matter, namely, that it is extended, which we could never argue, or apprehend, or even imagine, if we knew it merely as the cause of unextended sensations. I therefore reject it entirely. But the consequences I have sketched in last paragraph follow, if we adopt the theory. Under this view, I was entitled to point out an oversight in Mr Mill's account of the properties of matter, which he represents as being resistance, extension, and figure, thus omitting, I said, those powers mentioned by Locke, by which one body operates upon another. "Thus the sun has a power to make wax white, and fire to make lead fluid." When I said so I had entered a good way, notwithstanding his insinuation to the contrary, into the cloud of Mr Mill's mode of thought, farther, perhaps, than I was welcome. He now in replying to me (p. 248), is obliged to talk

of one group of possibilities of sensations, "destroying or modifying another such group;" and this certainly not by laws of sensation or association, but by laws acting independently of any discoverable cause in the series which constitutes mind. We have now got, by logical consequence, from Mr Mill's theory, a considerably complicated view of Matter, as a group of causes obeying laws of co-existence and unconditional succession, and one group influencing another, or destroying it, and all independent of any volitions of mine, or laws in my mind. The idea is, after all, inadequate, as it does not include extension, but it is certainly utterly inconsistent with his theory, that the notion and belief of Matter "may have come unto us by the laws of our constitution, without being a revelation of any objective reality."

This is confirmed by the language he uses in answering Mr O. Hanlon. He admits "that there is a sphere beyond my consciousness;" and "the laws which obtain in my consciousness, also obtain in the sphere beyond it." This, of course, refers to our conviction as to there being other minds as well as our own (p. 253). I am not sure that his argument for the existence of such minds is conclusive. "I am aware, by experience, of a group of Permanent Possibilities of Sensation which I call my body, and which my experience shews to be an universal condition of every part of my thread of consciousness. I am also aware of a great number of other groups, resembling the one that I call my body, but which have no connection, such as that has, with the remainder of my thread of consciousness. This disposes me to draw an inductive inference, that those other groups are connected with other threads of consciousness, as mine is with my own. If the evidence stopped here, the inference would be but an hypothesis, reaching only to the inferior degree of inductive evidence called Analogy. The evidence, however, does not stop here; for, having made the supposition that real feelings, though not experienced by myself, lie behind these phenomena of my own consciousness, which, from the resemblance to my body, I call other human bodies, I find that my subsequent consciousness presents those very sensations, of speech heard, of movements, and other outward demeanour seen, and so forth, which, being the effects or consequents of actual feelings in my own case, I should expect to follow upon those other hypothetical feelings, if they really exist: and thus the hypothesis is verified. It is thus proved inductively, that there is a sphere beyond my consciousness: *i.e.*, that there are other consciousnesses beyond it; for there exists no parallel evidence in regard to matter." Now, I am not sure that an infant mind, with only the furniture allowed by Mr Mill, and without a knowledge

direct or by legitimate inference of body, and apart from an intuitive law of cause and effect, could conduct such a process. The actual attainments of every mature mind shew, by a legitimate inference, that there must be more capacities and inlets of ideas than Mr Mill supposes. But, passing this, let us examine the legitimacy of the process. There is first the difficulty, already urged, of getting out of the sensations which have no outness, to the conception of an "outer sphere." Then, is it not conceivable that the notion and belief in regard to other people's mind may have come to us by the laws of our constitution, without implying any objective reality? And if so, are we not by the law of parcimony shut up to a solitary egoism as the more philosophical theory? that is, I may look on myself as a series of sensations aware of itself, with possibilities of sensation in groups and successions, among which I place, what would be called, in the language I employ, my fellow creatures. No doubt, another hypothesis may be made, and seems to have its verifications; but the simple hypothesis, which explains all by the laws of my constitution, is to be preferred, if it explains the phenomena of other people's minds, as I believe it to do quite as satisfactorily as it does our notion of and belief in Matter. If we draw back from this, and stand upon the hypothesis and verification, then I urge that a like process requires me to postulate, that these groups of possibilities in my body and beyond it have an objective reality independent of me, and obeying laws of their own, and not laws of my constitution. Of the conceivable conclusions reached, Mr Mill's seem to me the most hesitating and incongruous. He must, I suspect, either logically remain for ever within the sphere of the Ego, with possibilities he knows not what; or, if he once go beyond it, he must include not only other minds, but material objects following laws independent of our subjective constitution or perceptions.

We have now to look at the attempts which Mr Mill has made to turn aside the force of the reported experimental cases which I had urged against him. To prove that the eye is immediately cognisant, not merely of colour, but of surface, I had adduced the case reported by Dr Franz of Leipsic, which Mr Mill seems never to have heard of before, though it was given in the Transactions of the Royal Society for 1841. A youth born blind had his sight restored at the age of seventeen; and when a sheet of paper, on which two strong black lines had been drawn, the one horizontal and the other vertical, was placed before him at the distance of about three feet, on opening his eye, "after attentive examination, he called the lines by their right denominations." What? asks Mr Mill. It is clear he called them horizontal and vertical, having got the

terms by his mathematical education, and knowing what were the things by the sense of touch. Mr Mill allows (pp. 287–290) that this case, if fairly reported, would require a considerable modification of his doctrine, and that it looks like an experimental proof, that something which admits of being called extension, “may be perceived by sight at the very first use of the eyes.” But he tries to throw doubts on the accuracy of the report, evidently because it runs counter to his theory. It is a suspicious circumstance, he says, that the youth knew a cube and a sphere placed before him not to be drawings, of which he could have no idea—as if he could not have had some idea of what persons seeing meant by drawings, through the descriptions which they had given. And if there be any truth in the case at all, it is clear that the youth perceived at once vertical and horizontal lines, squares, circles, triangles, and the difference between the cube and the sphere. Mr Nunneley’s case proves the same thing, the boy could at once perceive “the differences in the shape of objects,” though he could not tell as to the cube and the sphere, which was which. It appears that in this case, it was some time before the boy could identify his perceptions of touch with those of sight. This is in accordance with what I have stated. The youth in Dr Franz’s case could do it more rapidly than the boy in Nunneley’s case, because the former had a mathematical training; but even he required examination and consideration, so that the two cases exactly correspond. There is nothing odd in the circumstance that Franz’s youth could not form, from what he saw, “the idea of a square and disc, until he perceived a sensation of what he saw in the points of his fingers, as if he really touched the object;” for it was thus he identified the perceptions which he was now receiving with those which he formerly had. Mr Mill will only admit after all, that though the youth is reported as seeing lines, circles, triangles, yet this “does not prove that we perceive extension by sight, but only that we have discriminative sensations of sight corresponding to all the diversities of superficial extension;”—as if Hamilton had not demonstrated that discriminate sensations of colour imply the perception of bounding lines, and therefore of figure. I do not know if the history of speculative philosophy affords a more startling case of the determination of a theorist, not to found his theory on facts, but to twist the facts to suit his theory, which he is determined to adhere to at all hazards.

This may be the proper place for referring to the now famous case of Platner, which both Hamilton and Mill have been using, but which in fact helps neither, and perplexes both. Platner, without giving a detail of the facts, comes to the conclusion that “touch is altogether incompetent to afford us the

representation of extension and space, and is not even cognisant of local exteriority," and that a person born blind, could have no idea of extension. These observations do not agree with those of any other person I am acquainted with. Mr Mill was obliged to say, that Platner "had put a false colour on the matter, when he says his patient had no perception of extension." He now tells us that he does not agree with Platner that "the notions of figure and distance come originally from sight" (p. 280). But if Platner's case does not prove this, it proves nothing. I believe it does prove nothing. It is quite inconsistent with the simple experiments, which, with the aid of Mr Kinghan, I wrought on young children born blind. I have an idea that Platner was led astray by not distinguishing between the idea of extension, which is original both to sight and touch, with the power of measuring it, which is acquired. Mr Mill admits all that I claim, and all that Platner denies, "that a person born blind can acquire, by a mere gradual process, all that is in our notion of space, except the visible picture," that is, the colour in the picture.

To shew that we intuitively know our bodily frame as extended by the sense of touch, I had quoted at length from the cases adduced by Müller. According to that illustrious physiologist, we localise our affections received by the senses; and the law of our nature is, that in touch or feeling, we place the sensation at the spot where the nerve normally terminates. It is thus, I believe, that we acquire a knowledge of our frame as having one part out of another, and as extended. All this I hold to be original and intuitive, so strongly so, that persons who have their limbs cut off, have, ten or twenty years after, a sense of the integrity of the limb. Mr Mill says he can explain this by association of ideas. I deny that he can, for surely such a length of time was sufficient to destroy the old association, which had nothing to keep it alive, and to create a new one. He tells me that, according to my theory, the pain should have been felt in the stump. I believe, on the contrary, that after so long an experience without a limb, this should have been the case, according to Mr Mill's theory. My theory—no, not my theory, but Müller's—is, that there is an original law which leads us to localise the affection at the spot where the nerve in its healthy and proper action terminates. When, in the restoration of a nose, a flap of skin is turned down from the forehead, and made to unite with the stump of the nose, the new nose thus formed has, as long as the isthmus of skin, by which it maintains its connections, remains undivided, the same sensations as if it were still in the forehead. This, Mr Mill says, should not be, according to my theory, and there is a good deal of self-complacent chuckling over me, as if my

facts overthrew my theory. This implies a misunderstanding of the facts. According to the law, as I have expounded it, as long as the nerve is imbedded in the isthmus of skin taken from the forehead, it should be felt in the forehead. Mr Mill takes care not to quote the further fact, that is, "when the communication of the nervous fibres of the new nose with those of the forehead is cut off by the division of the isthmus of skin, the sensations are of course no longer referred to the forehead; the sensibility of the nose is at first absent, but is gradually developed." According to the association theory, the affection should have been felt in the forehead, not till the isthmus was cut, but till the old association was gone, and this, according to Mr Mill, might not have been for twenty years. Be it observed, that when the flesh is cut off from the forehead, and the nerve comes to have its normal position in the nose, the sensation is felt there. My theory is thus simply the expression of the facts. But whatever doubt there may be about these phenomena, there can be none about other facts which I have adduced. Whatever dispute there may be as to cases in which there has been an association formed between a limb once existing but now lost, there can be none as to persons who never had the limb, and in whose case the association could not have been formed, but who are reported as having a sense of it. Professor Valentin mentions cases which I have quoted, which shew, "that individuals who are the subjects of congenital imperfection, or the absence of the extremities, have, nevertheless, the internal sensations of such limbs in their perfect state." It is curious that Mr Mill has taken no notice of these decisive cases which I have adduced as setting the whole question at rest.

Mr Mill dilates on two cases, to which I have referred without attaching much importance to them. The shrinking of the frame when boiling liquid is poured down the throat, seems to shew that we localise the pain at a spot of which we cannot know the site by touch or experience. Mr Mill thinks the action purely automatic (p. 303). Now I am disposed to think that there may be an action of the will directed to the seat of sensation. I believe that at a very early age, and long before they have any acquired perceptions of locality, they will indicate vaguely the seat of the pain. My instance may not be the best, it is rather negative: "if a child is wounded in the arm, it will not hold out the foot." This should not be construed as meaning that the infant will systematically hold out its foot; for this would suppose that it has much more knowledge than it can yet have of mother or doctor watching it. But at an early age, there are apparently voluntary movements which enable the mother and doctor to discover the seat of the pain.

I agree with Mr Mill, "there are some difficulties, not yet completely resolved, respecting the localisation of our internal pains, for the solution of which we need more careful and intelligent observation of infants." The question is set at rest, not by such a case, which I am prepared to abandon, if disproven, without the least injury to my argument, but by the fact reported by Professor Valentin, which Mr Mill has declined to notice.*

Mr Mill thinks that the eye originally gives us only colour and not extension. He does not allow—though the cases now adduced seem to prove it—that we have original perceptions of our bodily frame as affected. How, then, according to him, do we get the idea of extension? Following Dr Brown, he thinks that we get it by the sweep of the arm in space; and he quotes, with approbation, Professor Bain's method of working out this hypothesis. In my *Examination of Mill*, I endeavoured to meet this by psychological considerations, and shewed that a sweep of the arm or leg, considered merely as a group of sensations without extension, could not give us the idea of extension. I was not aware then that a German metaphysician, in examining the theory of Brown, had entirely disproved it by an experimental case. According to this theory, a person born without arms or legs could have no idea of space; but Schopenhauer has brought forward the case of Eva Lauk, an Esthonian girl, fourteen years old, born without arms or legs, but who, according to her mother, had developed herself intellectually quite as rapidly as her brothers and sisters, and without the use of limbs had reached a correct judgment concerning the magnitude and distance of visible

* In a foot-note I had uttered a sentence in regard to a case quoted by Mill from Hamilton, who gets it from Maine de Biran, who takes it from a report of Rey Regis, in regard to a patient, who, though he retained a sense of pain, had lost the power of localising the feeling. I pronounced the case "valueless, as evidently the functions of the nervous apparatus were deranged." Mr Mill allows that this single case is not conclusive (p. 295); and with this I would have been satisfied, had he not gone on to argue from it that "localisation does not depend on the same conditions with the sensations themselves." Be it so; in the normal state, the nerves localise the feeling. "The patient, as he gradually recovered the use of his limbs, gradually also recovered the power of localising his sensations." I do not attach much importance to the following reports of the experience of insane persons; but they are worthy of being mentioned, as shewing how intimately our abiding perception of our bodily frame is bound up with the *skin sense* and its localising tendency. "A woman," whose case Esquirol tells, "had complete anaesthesia of the surface of the skin: she believed that the devil had carried off her body. A soldier who was severely wounded at the battle of Austerlitz considered himself dead from that time; if he were asked how he was, he invariably replied, that 'Lambert no longer lives; a cannon ball carried him away at Austerlitz. What you see here is not Lambert, but a badly imitated machine,'—which he failed not to speak of as it. The sensibility of his skin was lost."—Maudsley, *Physiology and Pathology of the Mind*, p. 242.

objects quite as quickly as they.* Such a fact as this undermines the theory of the mode in which we gain our idea of extension, and with it the whole philosophic superstructure which Mill and Bain have been rearing with such laboured and ill-spent ingenuity. The cases adduced by Müller, and that reported by Franz, shew how it is we get our idea of extension; we get it by the immediate perception of our bodily frame in feeling, and, by means of the eye perceiving the coloured and extended surface before it. There is an impression among many that somehow Mr Mill and Mr Bain have physiology on their side. I confidently affirm that their peculiar philosophy is not supported by a single reported case, and that most of the reported cases are entirely against them.

I now turn to the discussion of a point of perhaps greater importance than any other started by Mr Mill's philosophy. It relates to the power of association to generate new ideas, and to produce belief,—in fact, to take the place of judgment or the comparison of things. It is, perhaps, the most fatal of all the errors in Mr Mill's speculations. It was on this account I dwelt so much on it—more than any other of Mr Mill's critics.

The two principal elements out of which Mr Mill generates all our ideas, are sensation and association. I have found fault with him for never telling us what is involved in sensation. We have seen in this paper that he is not sure whether time may not be involved in it—a view which would entirely change its nature. He never sees what is really involved in sensation, which is never felt except a sensation of self. But I have a still greater complaint against him for never telling us precisely what association can do, and what it cannot do. He everywhere ascribes to it, in language derived from material action, a *chemical* power: two ideas coming together may generate a third, different from either of the original ones. This is making association a source of new ideas. In other words, he gives to mere association a power which the *a priori* philosophers have given to the intellect; and surely with much more justice, for even on the supposition that association is the occasion of the new idea, the new idea must proceed from some mental capacity joined with association. Mr Mill does not render any account of the law, and the limit of this power, supposed to be in association. It is a chemical power, but then the chemist can tell us what is the nature and

* My attention was called to this case by Mr Bleeck, in his *Mr J. S. Mill's Psychological Theory*. It is quoted by Schopenhauer in his *Die Welt als Wille*, vol. ii. c. 4, and is taken from *Frorieps Neue Notizen aus dem Gebiete r Natur*, July 1838.

the law of the chemical power ; he says, Put one proportion of oxygen and another proportion of hydrogen in a certain relation, and water is the product. But Mr Mill never ventures to express any such definite law ; he leaves everything vague and loose. He finds certain peculiar ideas in the mind, such as those we have in regard to beauty and moral good ; and he satisfies himself with saying that they are generated by sensations and ideas, which have in themselves no such qualities. I see no reason which he has for claiming for his system of generalising ideas out of sensation by associations, such a superiority over Condillac's "transformed sensations."

I have denied that association is ever a source of new ideas. I have admitted that as the issue of "long and repeated conjunction, ideas, each it may be with its own peculiar feeling, succeed each other with incalculable rapidity, so that we cannot distinguish between them, and that they may coalesce in a result." "But in the agglomeration there seems to be nothing but the ideas, the feelings, and their appropriate impressions coalescing ; there is no new generation—no generation of an idea, nor in the separate parts of the collection." At this point, Mr Mill meets me (pp. 342–3). He is obliged to concede that "facts in the case of ideas cannot be appealed to, for they are the very matter disputed." It clears the ground very much to have this admission. It is implied that there are new ideas generated by the action of the mind ; and Mr Mill ascribes to association what our profounder philosophers have ascribed to the intellect,—making their case more parallel to that of the chemists, who give to their elements a chemical power quite different from the mechanical. Not able to get proof from ideas, he says, "There are abundant instances in sensation."

"I had thought," he says, "that such an experiment as that of the wheel with seven colours, in which seven sensations following one another very rapidly, become, or at least generate one sensation, and that one totally different from any of the seven, sufficiently proved the possibility of what Dr M'Cosh denies ; but he writes as if he had never heard of the experiment" ; and he refers to the ribbon of light produced by waving rapidly a luminous body. Now, it so happens that I had produced the ring when a boy, by a lighted piece of paper ; in my college days, I had seen the experiment of the seven colours ; and, in my mature life, I have seen a wheel in rapid motion appearing stationary when made visible by instantaneous electric light. But I looked on these as experiments, not in regard to mental states, but simply about light, and the way in which it affects our bodily organs. The wheel under electric light looks stationary, not

as the result of successive sensations of motion, for we have not been percipient of the motion, but because we see it only for the instant. In the ribbon of flaming colour, the impression produced by each of the rays lingers for a certain short time, till the impression produced by those that rapidly follow mixes with it, and the figure on the retina becomes a continuous circle. In the same way with the seven colours, the organic affections mingle and become one, and are transmitted as one to the mind, which ceases to have a sensation of the seven colours, and has the sensation of one. This is not a case of seven separate mental sensations generating a new one. As long as the wheel with the seven colours rotates slowly, so that there is time for the one set of rays to disappear from the retina before the other overtakes them, there are seven sensations, but no eighth generated by the seven. If the wheel is seen by instantaneous light, seven colours are seen, but no eighth. Mr Mill has stated the facts precisely in an analogous case furnished by the sense of hearing (p. 618): "When a number of sounds in perfect harmony strike the ear simultaneously, we have but a single impression,—we perceive but one mass of sound." Mr Mill was bound to produce a case of two or more separate mental affections producing a new one never before experienced; and he has produced simply a case of the blending of rays of light in retinal or nervous action. Again facts fail him, and he is left with a baseless hypothesis.

This brings us to the consideration of the now notorious examples which he adduces of the most certain principles of arithmetic and geometry being believable in other circumstances: that is, in the possibility of our believing that $2 + 2$ may be 5; that parallel lines may meet; that any two right lines being produced will meet at two points; and that two or more bodies may exist in the same place. These cases are taken from *Essays by a Barrister*, who did not profess to be a metaphysician, who did not know what to make of them, except that he thought they were fitted to lessen our assurance of the certainty of objective truth. Mr Mill now makes the following singular addition to his statement of the two first of these cases: "Hardly any part of the present volume has been so maltreated by so great a number of critics, as the illustrations here quoted from an able and highly instructed contemporary thinker; which, as they were neither designed by their author, nor cited by me, as anything more than illustrations. I do not deem it necessary to take up space by defending. When a selection must be made, one is obliged to consider what one can best spare" (p. 87). This is surely far from satisfactory. Does, or does he not, give up the cases? If he does, he should

have said so in all honesty, and nobody would have thought the less of him. But he seems still inclined to retain them as illustrations, but does not think it necessary to defend them. I do hold that Mr Mill's principles do lead to these consequences, which have staggered so many, and made them review the principles which lead to such results—implying that man can reach no truth which might not be falsehood in other circumstances. But as Mr Mill does not care to defend them, I do not feel that I am called to continue my assault.

“The geometry of visibles has been noticed only by Dr M'Cosh, who rejects it as founded on the erroneous doctrine (as he considers it), that we cannot perceive by sight the third dimension of space.” This is not a full statement of the ground of my rejection. My language is, “These inferences can be deduced only by denying to vision functions which belong to it, and ascribing to it others which are not intuitive or original.” I hold it to be one of the functions of sight to give us a right line and a curved line. Such cases as those of Franz clearly shew that by sight alone we can perceive two straight lines; and having once seen them, we never could be made to believe that they could meet at two points and enclose a space; or that a straight line being continued could return itself again. Those who see colours must perceive the boundaries of colours, and these being often curved, would give us the idea of a curved line; and I am sure they would be obliged to look on a straight line returning into itself as a curve, and not a right line. So much for his denying to vision functions which belong to it, which was my main argument. But again, he ascribes to it functions which are not intuitive or original: for I hold that it is not the function of vision, but of touch, to reveal to us impenetrability; and a creature with sight, but not touch (even if it could live or reason at all), could argue nothing as to bodies either penetrating, or not penetrating, each other, or passing through each other, ‘without having undergone any change by this penetration.’”

In looking at these acknowledged consequences, I had ventured to point out the dangerous tendency of a doctrine which strips man of the power of reaching positive truth, and of pronouncing judgment on the reality of things. Because I have done so, he represents me as “preaching”; but preaching to one who is “already converted,” “an actual missionary of the same doctrine.” I am here tempted to remark, that Mr Mill himself “preaches” at times, as in those passages in which he charges Dr Mansel's doctrines as being “simply the most morally pernicious doctrine now current,” and hurls at him that tremendous passage, “I will call no being good who is not what I mean when I apply that epithet to my fellow creatures;

and if such a being can sentence me to hell, for not so calling him, to hell I will go." My preaching on this occasion has evidently had some effect ; it has hit a point in which Mr Mill seems to be sensitively tender. I am convinced that he has never seriously weighed the logical and practical tendency of his doctrine of nescience ; it looks as if there are times when he is unwilling to look at the consequences. He tells us that in his *Logic* he has been instructing his readers to form their belief exclusively on evidence. But did he never hear a preacher waxing longest and loudest on the points of his doctrine which he felt to be the weakest and most vulnerable ? In regard to ordinary mundane matters, Mr Mill is very careful to bid us look for evidence ; but the evidence, in the last resort, is found to be baseless, thus rendering the whole superstructure insecure in the estimation of all who are bent on looking beneath the surface. He corrects Mr Grote when he seems to say, that truth is to every man what seems truth to him ; but his own doctrine is equally unsatisfactory when we follow it to its foundation. "We grant," he says, "that, according to the philosophy which we hold in common with Mr Grote, the fact itself, if knowable to us, is relative to our perceptions, to our senses, or our internal consciousness ; and our opinion about the fact is so too : but the truth of the opinion is a question of relation between these two relatives, one of which is an objective standard for the other" (*Dissert.* vol. ii., art. Grote's Plato). That is, we are to have witnesses, but our conviction, nay, truth itself, leans on the deposition of witnesses, each of which supports the other, but each of which may be a liar. The earnest and logical mind is made to feel that in all matters bearing on the depths of philosophy, and the heights of religion, and fitted to bear it up above this cold earth, it has nothing left on which to lean.

In my *Examination* I had been at great pains to point out the ambiguity in the word "conceive," and the paronymous words, "conception," "conceivable," and "inconceivable." It is of essential importance, if we would avoid senseless logomachy, to determine the meaning in which we employ the phrase when we use man's power of conception as a test of necessary truth, or his incapacity of conception as a test of error. I distinguished three senses of the word : (1.) image in the phantasy, as when we picture Mont Blanc ; (2.) the generalised notion, as "mountain" ; (3.) native cognition, belief, or judgment, in regard to objects ; and I shewed that it is only when used in the third sense that it can be legitimately employed as a test of truth. I shewed that it was not in this sense that Antipodes were supposed by our fathers to be inconceivable, but because they seemed to be contrary to experience,—a pre-

possession which gave way before farther experience. I am not aware that any one ever objected to *Antipodes* on the ground of a native cognition, belief, or judgment. I charged Mr Mill with taking advantage, of course unconsciously, of the ambiguity of the phrase. Any apparent success which he may have had in explaining necessity of conception by association, arises solely from his shewing how one image suggests another,—how, for instance, darkness suggests ghosts, or a precipice the danger of falling. I was quite aware that Mr Mill, in answering Hamilton, had shewn that the phrase had several meanings; but then, I asserted, that he himself was led astray, and was leading astray his readers, by the ambiguity. As my work was passing through the press, I observed, that in the sixth edition of his *Logic* (I., pp. 303–306), lately published, he had charged Mr Spencer as deriving “no little advantage” from the ambiguity, and alleges that the popular use of the word “sometimes creeps in with its associations, and prevent him from maintaining a clear separation between the two.” I simply noticed this in a foot note, and added that Mr Mill “continues to take advantage of the ambiguity, which is greater than he yet sees.” Mr Mill thinks this “curious” (p. 88). The note was hastily written, and I admit my meaning was not so clear as I have now endeavoured to make it.

The only subject remaining to be discussed is his defence of his own logical views, and his criticism of mine. He is pleased to say (p. 388) that “the chapter of Dr M'Cosh, headed the ‘Logical Notion,’ contains much sound philosophy.” But he complains of “the persistent impression which the author keeps up that I do disagree with him.” Now, I believe that our views do disagree, and I was anxious to point out the mistakes in a work which is of such value and influence as Mr Mill's *Logic*. Mr Mill is a nominalist, and looks at the name, its denotation, and connotation, instead of the mental exercise; whereas, I am a conceptualist (though, certainly, not in the sense in which many are), and have laboured to bring out the process of mind involved in the notion, judgment, and reasoning.

We differ in regard to the General Notion, or Common Term. I hold that every such notion or term has both extension and comprehension, or intension,—that is, both objects and attributes,—whereas, he looks solely at the comprehension, or the attributes. I had said, that I think it desirable to have a phrase to denote the class of things comprised in the general notion, and that the best word I can think of is Concept. In opposition to this, he says the word “class” is sufficient. But the word class is rather significant of an objective arrangement, existing independent of my notice of it,—say, of the class *Rosaceæ*, which had an existence in nature before naturalists

had observed it, or given a name to it. He admits, that in order to belief, "a previous mental conception of the facts is an indispensable condition," and "that the real object of belief is the fact conceived." Now, the word Concept stands with me, not for the class, but for the class conceived, and is the best I can think of. He has a glimpse of the truth when he speaks of extension (p. 421) "as a name for the aggregate of objects possessing the attributes included in the concept." He tells us (p. 372) "that concepts cannot be thought as being universal, but only as being part of the thought of an individual. Here, again, conceive, or "think," used in the sense of image; whereas it should be employed in the sense of judge. A Concept is a notion of an indefinite number of objects (extension) possessing common properties (comprehension), the notion being such as to include all objects possessing the common properties. It is thus emphatically universal.

We differ, also, in regard to Abstract Notions. "It is evident that the existence of abstract ideas,—the conception of the class qualities by themselves, and not as embodied in an individual,—is effectually precluded by the law of inseparable association." I acknowledge, that in the sense of "imaging," we cannot have a conception of an attribute apart from a concrete object. But, in the sense of "think of," we can apprehend a part as a part,—an attribute as an attribute; and this is what I mean by abstraction. I think it of great moment to distinguish between the abstract and general notions, which the Kantian logicians, German and British,—departing from certain older logicians,—everywhere confound. "Rationality" is an abstract term, denoting an attribute, and is different from "man," which is a general notion connecting objects. By drawing this distinction, and carrying it out consequentially, we throw light on logical judgment, and settle some of the questions discussed in the present day. There are, I hold, judgments in which we compare mere abstracts, and in which there is no general notion involved. Such judgments are always convertible or substitutive (called equipollent by certain older logicians),—that is, we can turn the subject into the predicate, and the predicate into the subject, without any change, which we cannot do in comparing universal notions. Because "men are mortals," we cannot say, therefore, "mortals are men;" but if "honesty is the best policy," we can say, "the best policy is honesty," because both terms are abstract.

I have represented Numbers as Abstract Notions, and the judgments involving them, as being convertible in consequence. Thus, 3×3 being 9, we can say, 9 is 3×3 . But Mr Mill says that the terms are general. "The objects embraced in 9 are nine apples, nine marbles, nine hours, nine miles, and all the

other aggregations of which 9 can be predicated. Every numeral is the name of a class, and a most comprehensive class, consisting of things of all imaginable qualities." Now, it was a disadvantage under which I laboured in criticising Mr Mill's "Formal Logic," that I was not able to expound my own views with sufficient fulness. But I have all along explained to my college classes that the same phrase may stand for an abstract and a general notion. I hold that numerals, 1, 2, 3, are primarily abstract qualities of things—a quality of that one thing, of these two things, or three things. It is because they are so that the propositions comparing them are convertible. But, then, we very often turn abstract names into general ones (as we also do general ones into abstract ones), and we do speak of 1, 2, 3 as standing for a class. We so employ them when we say, " 3×3 make 9," which we can only convert by saying "some things making 9 are 3×3 "—for $6 + 3$ also *make* 9. There is surely a profound distinction here with far-reaching consequences, but this is not the place for the farther development of it.

As not seeing that Extension, as well as Comprehension, is involved in all our general notions, and so in all our judgments involving general notions, Mr Mill has not been able, to give a clear account of the Proposition. He says (p. 420) "all men," and the "class men," are "expressions which point to nothing but attributes; they cannot be interpreted except in comprehension." Now, I have admitted that in the greater number of propositions the uppermost thought and sense are in comprehension, and I am represented as "having partially just conceptions on the subject." But I hold that in all judgments of the kind he is speaking of, there is thought in extension, and that they can be interpreted in extension, and have a meaning in extension. When I say, "Gorillas are not men," I mean are not included in the class men; and in many other propositions the uppermost thought is in extension. Of course, as the one implies the other, the proposition has also a meaning in comprehension.

This is the proper place for correcting a misapprehension of Mr Mill's, as to what constitutes the principle of identity, which, he thinks, should be expressed thus (p. 466): "Whatever is true in one form of words, is true in every other form of words which convey the same meaning." He applies this to what "Kant terms Conclusions of the Understanding, and Dr M'Cosh, Implied or Transposed Judgments." "They are not conclusions, nor fresh acts of judgment, but the original expressed in other words." But this is not an adequate account. The law of identity requires that the relation of the things compared should be considered the same, not merely

under different expressions, but in different circumstances, positions, and forms. It being given us that "all men have a conscience," we are sure it cannot be true that "no man has a conscience," or that "some men have not a conscience." These are not the same propositions expressed in other words; they would be felt to be true and implied, though not expressed in words at all.

There is one other logical point in which Mr Mill and I differ theoretically. I hold that in reasoning there is always thought in Extension; always a general principle involved constituting the major premises when the argument is fully unfolded. In his own Formula, there is a major premiss: "Attribute A is a mark of attribute B," which means, when properly interpreted, "Whatever object possesses attribute A has also attribute B," clearly a proposition involving Extension, nay, actually, thought of in Extension. It is only when we have such a generalised maxim that the particular case constituting the minor premiss warrants the conclusion. "The gorilla cannot speak," this cannot give us the conclusion, "the gorilla is not a man," unless we proceed on the general principle that "all beings placed in the class man are possessed of speech." So far as our views bear on the practical evolution of logical formulæ, I believe Mr Mill and I are at one. We both think that the old logical formulæ, which are in Extension, may be allowed to keep the place which they have had for ages; and we both think that Sir W. Hamilton has done good service to logic by shewing us how, when any good purpose is to be served by it, we may turn reasoning in Extension into the form of reasoning in Comprehension. I cannot agree with him, however, when he gives as a reason for allowing the reasoning in Extension to remain, that "concrete language requiring for its formation a lower degree of abstraction was earliest formed, took possession of the field, and is still the most familiar" (p. 484). I am not sure that thought in Extension is more concrete than thought in Comprehension. I hold that reasoning is spontaneously in Extension, and that it is thus that the forms assumed this shape, took possession of the field, and are still most familiar. When we argue that "the Red Indians are responsible because they are human beings," we put the major in the form, "human beings are responsible," not because "responsible" is more concrete than "possessing responsibility," but because we must have a general law, and put "all human beings in the class of beings possessing responsibility." The premises as propositions may be thought of primarily in Comprehension—the Extension however, being always involved; but in reasoning, the Extension involved must be actually thought of in order to give us the major proposition. The formula in Extension, in the ordinary

sylogistic analysis, is thus the expression, not of artificial but of spontaneous reasoning.

I have now faced Mr Mill at all the points in which he has seen fit to meet me.* But I cannot close the discussion without referring to the points at which he has not deigned to meet me. I had said a good deal about his mode of procedure, and criticised his "Psychological Method," shewing how it should be adopted only with important explanations and modifications; in particular, that we are at liberty to proceed on this method only on the condition that we carefully look at all that is in the idea, and that we explain it all by the theory. Again, I had shewn that Mr Mill, while seeming to explain all our ideas by sensation and association, had been obliged to call in as many assumed metaphysical principles as Reid and Hamilton. I had collected his admissions into heads; I had shewn that they are utterly inconsistent with his apparently association theory; and that if logically followed out, they must carry him much farther than he is disposed to go. On none of these points does he offer a word of explanation. I had criticised his doctrine of causation, shewing that what he explains by experience is not our conviction as to cause and effect, but in the uniformity of nature. I had reviewed with considerable care his very defective account of mathematical axioms and definitions, and of demonstration. I had examined his genesis of our idea of moral good, and his whole utilitarian theory. I had invited him to say whether he thinks a conclusive argument for the existence of God could be constructed on his principles. It is curious that while he has seen fit to meet me on other points, some of them in no way essential to my argument, he has not noticed these all-important criticisms. I am perhaps not justified in arguing that my positions must therefore be unassailable; but it will, at least, be allowed that since no attack has been made upon them by my acute opponent, I am not required, for the present, to offer any farther defence.

JAMES M'COSH.

* I am glad he has called attention (p. 76) to my complaint of the vagueness of the distinction between knowledge and faith. He acknowledges that the distinction, as drawn by me, agrees with the cases to which I have applied it, and says that every definition of belief must include these cases. But, then, he sees a difficulty in carrying it through the entire region of thought. I am satisfied, if it holds good in the region in which I have employed it, that is, in regard to primitive cognitions in which the objects are present, and primitive beliefs, in which we are convinced of their existence, though they are not present. But even in other regions, it calls attention to the circumstance that in our very scientific knowledge there is belief involved—always, however, with other mental exercises, such as judgment.

ART. VI.—*Ireland and the Irish.*

1. *England and Ireland.* By JOHN STUART MILL, M.P.
2. *The Irish Church and Land Question.* A Letter to the Honourable Chichester Fortescue, M.P. By EARL RUSSELL.
3. *Contributions to an Inquiry into the State of Ireland.* By LORD DUFFERIN, M.P.
4. *A Plea for the Celtic Race.* By ISAAC BUTT, Q.C.
5. *Tenant Wrong Illustrated; or a History of Kilkee in relation to Landlordism.* By REV. SYLVESTER MALONE.
6. *The Irish in America.* By J. F. MAGUIRE, M.P.
7. *The Irish Church.* By W. GODKIN.
8. *The Life and Letters of MacCarthy Mor; compiled from State Paper Office Documents.* By DANIEL MACCARTHY.
9. *The Fate and Fortunes of Hugh O'Neil Earl of Tyrone, and of Rory O'Donnel Earl of Tyrconnel.* By REV. B. P. MEEHAN.
10. *The Senchus Mor; Vol. 1. of the Ancient Laws of Ireland.* Published by Royal Commission.

WITH its second city quite lately in a state of siege, with the Habeas Corpus Act suspended for another year, and with prisoners, condemned to fifteen years' penal servitude, saying, as they leave the dock, "I hope to see the English Government overthrown before that time," Ireland must be admitted to be in a very strange and unsatisfactory state. We cannot call its present condition abnormal; for if the years since Strongbow's expedition, during which the country has been thoroughly quiet and well-affected, be reckoned up, they will be found to make a very small part of the period during which the connection between the two countries has lasted.

With the exception, perhaps, of Messene by the Spartans, there has never been a conquest so unsatisfactory, so discreditable to all concerned, as that of Ireland by England. The state of things is well expressed by M. de Lasteyrie, when he speaks of Ireland as a country, "Qui n'a jamais su se défendre, et qu'on n'a jamais su dompter." The native race has neither been extirpated, nor assimilated, nor made friendly, nor even thoroughly subjugated. "It was conquered too late (say some) after the remorseless thoroughness of early conquest had passed away." But surely, though the Norman and first English settlers were, times and circumstances considered, fairly humane, the wars of Elizabeth were as desolating, the fierceness of Cromwell's colonists was as unsparing, as anything recorded even of the Spaniards in Mexico. Those who are not familiar with Irish State Papers know very little of what went

* The following paper expresses the views of an intelligent clergyman of the Church of England on one of the most perplexing problems of the present day. With those opinions, so far as they go, we are inclined to agree; but the subject is environed with so many difficulties on every side, that we confess ourselves unable to foresee how it may be satisfactorily settled.—Ed.

on in those days of violence.* They have read in their school histories the stock charges of treachery, cruelty, and disaffection heaped on the Irish by each successive compiler, but they have not cared to ask how it is that the nation got to deserve (if it really does deserve) this character. They have been told by their newspapers that "the Celt" is by nature what their school historians assure them the Irish have always been; but, if they live north of the border, they are met by the difficulty that a considerable body of "Celts," a good deal less mixed, probably, than any in Ireland, are found to be the very reverse of all that the Irish "Celt" is supposed inevitably to be. We have only to read the Queen's Highland Journal, to feel that race is not all-powerful in settling national characteristics. Those noble gillies, nature's true gentlemen, to whom her Majesty did not hesitate to trust her children—those men who stand on such a very different level from the English serving-man—are really of the same blood as the Donegal peasant, perhaps as the Mayo cottier. Circumstances have told on the one for good, on the other far too unmixedly for evil, until now the difference between Highlander and Irishman is become so great that we are apt to forget the identity of the two in speech and race, and to lose sight of the truth that this chivalry which her Majesty recognised in her Highland gillies had its birth in Ireland; that there it was systematised, and became a bulwark against brute force, just as it did, much later, in Celtic France against the tyrannical feudalism brought in by the Teutons. It is not, then, that the work of conquering Ireland has been carried on in too gentle a spirit that it has failed to be done thoroughly. It is because England has never dealt with the work on a sufficiently broad scale. James I. shewed by his plantation of Ulster how the thing might be done; to have done it thoroughly would have been far easier two centuries before he began his settlement. But until Henry VIII.'s time the English Government seems to have been well content to leave Ireland to the mercy of the great Norman nobles and native chiefs, who, battling with one another whenever they had an excuse for so doing, owned a very precarious allegiance to the court of London. Conquer well once for all, and then leave people to settle down as best they can side by side; or else abstain from all attempts at subjugation, and, if you rule another people, rule (as we are now doing in India) with careful regard to their prejudices and peculiarities. These are the two rules of common sense; and in her dealings with Ireland,

* "No one knows (says Mr Froude), unless he has worked through the Record Office papers, the atrocious things which were done by Elizabeth's English troops. It is always the same miserable story—violent and spasmodic cruelties, followed by the cashiering of the troops to tempt a new rebellion; and then fresh cruelties"

England has unfortunately been guided by neither. The force which she employed in Ireland was almost always miserably inadequate to anything like thorough conquest; and yet her pretensions to regulate the dress, habits of life, laws and customs of the whole people, were so sweeping that only an absolute ruler should have dreamt of setting them up. Hence two necessary results: dissatisfaction on the part of the Irish, who, knowing the weakness of the invaders, were aggrieved at their insolence; and hatred mingled with contempt on the part of the English settlers, who, a few in the midst of a hostile nation, felt that their only chance of holding their ground was to cling together and to keep the natives down, and, at the same time, to encourage among them those divisions which the new-comers laughed at while they profited by them. This is the origin of "the dominant caste"—a name of evil import all through Irish history; and this "caste" has certainly not shewn any lack of remorselessness in carrying out its ends, or any special consideration for the people over whom it has tyrannised, and whom (not content with oppressing them) it has systematically vilified, until, as we said, it is impossible to open an English school history without finding a slur cast upon the character of what should long ago have been an integral portion of the British community. No wonder that Mr Mill in his latest work should tell us that Ireland in any other hands would have been far different from what it is, that any other European country would have succeeded far better than we have done. In no other European country has history been written in that unworthy spirit which too many English writers have adopted. Austrian histories are not full of abuse of the Bohemian or Hungarian character; French histories do not snarl at the peculiarities of the Gascon or the Lorrainer. "Give and take" in a kindly spirit seems understood and acted upon everywhere except in these islands, where even the grave historian Mr Froude, while pointing out the pitiable mistakes of Tudor policy, the wicked machiavelianism of the king, and the incompetency of his deputies, actually calls these things *Irish* blunders, and accounts for them by saying that when a man went to live in Ireland he seemed to lose his head, and straightway to cease to be a responsible being. This is certainly the most extraordinary way which we ever met with of explaining the tergiversations of a man like Lord Leonard Grey and the imbecility of a Skeffington. But, if historians are strangely undignified in their mode of writing about Ireland, newspapers are very much worse. The *Saturday Review*, naturally enough, scatters its barbed arrows at random; speaking the other day, for instance, of the wish expressed by the Dublin meeting, that Government should buy the railways, it is struck with admiration to find that "for once Irishmen are agreed on a plan, and that that plan is fairly common

sense." But it is certainly startling to find the *Times*, the accredited English paper all over the world, asserting (January 18) that "all Irishmen roll and slouch in their gait, never look you straight in the face, and always speak as if they had something in the background which they did not like to bring forward." And yet, we wonder that foreign nations should rate our "Irish difficulty" at more than its real value, and we smile at "the reams of foreign comment in which ignorance of the circumstances of England and Ireland is veiled under an appearance of philosophical disquisition." When the chief English newspaper writes, about once a week, in its usual insultingly flippant, and cruelly unfair way of Ireland, and when *Punch* vies with the *Dublin Weekly News* in aggravating the ill-feeling between the two countries by disgusting caricatures, it does not need much "semblance of philosophic disquisition" to prove that (although mixed juries may convict Fenian prisoners, and find Mr Sullivan and Mr Pigott guilty) things are not at all as they should be, and it is scarcely possible that any outsider can fail to be surprised at the strange way in which the English nation seems to take Irish disaffection as a matter of course. Fancy the effect of a series of *Punch's* cartoons, in which a "canny Scot" should figure in the way in which poor Pat figured, almost weekly, for a long while before and after the Manchester outrage. No, John Bull is not naturally ungenerous; but in studying Ireland and the Irish he has always looked at things through the glasses of the "dominant caste," and hence he has formed a very distorted notion of what an Irishman really is, and of what are the real wants and the true capabilities of the country. Hence, too, he is rather astonished, when he happens to be brought face to face with the Irish as they really are, to find that underneath all the noisy surface of disloyalty there is a solid stratum of quiet, good sense, for which, having grown to believe what he has been so industriously taught, he was hardly prepared, to give Irishmen credit. We have written at some length about this way of treating Irish matters, half in banter, half in bitterness, which is so sad a blot on the literature of the day, because we believe its effects are most injurious. It is one of those "sentimental grievances" at which it is so easy to smile, but which (as everybody knows) are felt, by nations even more than by individuals, with far greater intensity than material wrongs. Indeed, we are certain that a study of the Irish and American-Irish literature of the day would convince any one that this unwarrantable way of sneering at Ireland, this unworthy style of writing, due (as we said) to the misrepresentations of the "dominant caste," has tended more to keep the two peoples from amalgamating than any imaginary softness in the manner of the conquest, or even than any real want of

thoroughness in carrying it out. It has also tended to make the Irish what they are—*i.e.*, certainly not what the English press represents them to be, but yet very inferior in many ways to what they might have been. People at last get to be what they are constantly being told about themselves; they believe that a certain line of conduct will be expected from them, and they act accordingly.

So much, then, for the allegation that the Irish are what they are because their conquerors have been too considerate. The case is precisely the reverse: it unhappily seemed to suit English policy rather to maintain a garrison in Ireland than to conquer the country outright; but this very want of thoroughness has led to that unkindness in manner of which we complain, and which we believe has frequently in English newspapers reached a point at which the law ought to have taken cognisance of it.

Another remark, often made, is that Ireland suffers from not having had the advantage of passing under the Roman yoke. Whether this was an advantage or not, we believe is far more open to question than many people imagine; but the want, no doubt, accounts for certain differences between the way in which the English and Irish characters have developed. Whatever else England owes to the Roman conquest of Britain, we believe it owes to that conquest the degradation of its labouring poor, in many parts (despite the cry of "glorious Anglo-Saxon race") unquestionably the lineal descendants of those Britons who remained to be enslaved. Still, if Ireland was never brought under Roman rule, the same is true of Scandinavia, and of our own Scotland, to say nothing of the greater part of Germany. The fact is, not so much that Ireland has not gone through certain historical processes, but that Mr Mill is not far from the truth when he says his countrymen are conceited and unsympathetic, and unable to appreciate any excellence which is not cast in their own mould. England has not been, in the case of Ireland, a generous conqueror; and now she is far too fond of harshly scolding the Irish for faults which are in a great measure due to her mismanagement. English statesmen, as well as English people, have always been sadly wanting in what it is the fashion to call "political imagination."

We have placed this "sentimental grievance" first, because we are convinced that it has really more influence at the present moment than any other. Of course, within our limits, it is impossible to follow it out through all its branches, for it enters more or less into every relation of social as well as of political life. One more point we will notice, steadily pooh-poohed by England, passionately aimed at by Ireland—the development of national existence. There is an unsatisfied longing at the bottom of every Irish heart, a "crave," which is the strength of Fenianism, and accounts for a good deal of that negative sup-

port which (in spite of the denials of the English newspapers, and the rose-coloured picture drawn by Lord Mayo) disaffection receives from the well-to-do classes. Ireland is not a nation ; it is becoming more and more a province ; and that is a position which (after such a history as hers), no Irishman, of whatever creed and social position, can calmly contemplate for his country. We do not think that Scotland would have been the better, far from it, had she been annexed by "the greatest of all the Plantagenets." She would have lost much. Those 400 years from Bannockburn to the Union gave time for the nation's metal to get well tempered. The world, too, would have lost much. It would have lost a nation which, for its size, has done more and thought more than any nation since old Greek days ; while England, losing a worthy rival in many paths of progress, would merely have gained a few more counties, which would have shared the fate of most outlying counties. Ireland, too, shent as she has been of her national existence, has done more for the world, though, perhaps, less for her own material advancement than she would have done had she been "absorbed" in Plantagenet or Tudor times. The Irishman has set his mark, after a fashion, and that not always an ignoble one, on the world's history. He has done what, as a mere English provincial, he certainly would not have done. But it is sad work to recall the honours of men like Brown, and Lacy, and O'Donnel. The glory of exiles is poor beside the renown of that wonderful succession of Irish scholars who, before their brethren from North Britain had begun to learn and to teach, had carried the name of Scot from one end of Europe to the other, and had amused by their *perfervidum ingenium* those whom they astonished with the depth and versatility of their learning. No wonder Irishmen remember that, in the days when men like Columbanus went out and moved the world, Ireland was an independent nation. No sooner did the sad struggle begin, which, protracted through centuries, brutalized both sides, than Irish learning began to decay, Irish saintship was exchanged for degraded superstition, and the nation sank so much in general esteem that the popes actually passed decrees ousting the Irish Scots from the colleges which their ancestors had founded in Switzerland, in Germany,—almost all over Europe,—and transferring them to the Scots of the younger branch. Educated Irishmen, above all, cling to this idea of nationality, and reject with scorn the oft-repeated dictum, "Oh, the very best thing that can happen to the country is for it just to become as thoroughly English as Yorkshire is." If this was ever true, the time for such an absorption is hopelessly gone by. They feel that there is something higher than merely material success, and their reading about the Greek republics teaches them that intellectual activity

dies down when national independence is wholly gone. Athens, the Oxford of Rome, the dull priggish town where young men like Cicero's friend used to go, in order to graduate in polite literature, was a very different place from the Athens of *Æschylus* or Plato. Now, this crave for nationality may easily be satisfied if once the English can make up their minds to recognise it as fairly as they have, on the whole, recognised the Scotch national feeling. Scotland has had little to complain of in this way since the Union. The wicked legislation by which, in William III.'s days, the more wealthy country strove to crush the growing industry and trade of its neighbour, lasted but for a time. It did not do its work, as (unhappily) a parallel system of "protection against one of the members of the British family" did in the case of Ireland, mainly because Scotch trade and commerce did not receive its main impulse till after the '45. Scotland displays, all the empire over, her distinctive adornments; Scotch members manage all Scotch questions without any interference; Scotch peculiarities are respected; Scotland is that part of her dominions which the Queen most delights to honour. No one dreams of suggesting that the Lothians would be improved by becoming a second Norfolk, or that Glasgow would be the better for being as English as Manchester. Some of these may be trifling matters; but they are just the things which move men, and the deficiency might easily be supplied without any of Mr Mill's "peaceable revolutions." Look at the, now Royal, constabulary. They have nothing Irish about them, except a little harp put out of the way at the back of their caps, as if they were supposed to be thrusting Ireland's emblem from them. Why not have three or four regiments as Irish in their dress as the 45th itself is Highland in its garb? It is all very well to quibble about the national colour; that point would soon be settled when it was known that a national dress was to be adopted. Then, as to a royal residence in Connemara or at Killarney, so much has been said lately that it is useless to add more. We do not believe that this, or the appointment of a prince of the blood as permanent Lord-Lieutenant would be a heal-all for wounds of long standing, due to various causes, but we are certain it would be a palliative. Whether Irish members could ever be induced to act together, so as to admit of their managing all strictly Irish matters,—public works, local taxation, education, police and church questions,—is very doubtful. That the Scotch succeed so well is matter for admiration, and is a proof how strongly the national mind still retains the effects of the chastening and tempering process to which it was subjected during centuries of trial. All we can say is, Irish members could not make a worse hand of it, nor show off their antagonism more pitiably in private debate, than

they do now in the House. At any rate, the plan would be worth trying. People who are trusted rarely betray the trust. Our own view is, that if England withdrew its countenance from the "dominant caste," and ceased to govern Ireland through a portion of its people, we should soon find Irishmen of all classes getting on very much better with one another than they have hitherto done. They would know one another's real strength, and each would make allowance accordingly in a way which was impossible so long as one faction looked to England to support their ascendancy on the plea of hereditary loyalty, and the other made capital out of England's fears, and bargained (as in the case of the Lichfield House compact) to be free from interference as the price of keeping down disorder. Towards this harmonious working together of men so opposite in views as the two classes of Irish members, something might be done by an Irish Reform Bill, which should so redistribute the seats as to give adequate representation, and which should also introduce the ballot,—a necessity, we believe, among a people demoralised by the dread of their landlords on the one hand, and by the no less active dread of their priests on the other. Many more ways suggest themselves, in which it is possible to give scope for national sentiment, without in the least endangering the connection between the two countries. Nay, everything which tends to foster a healthy national feeling of this kind, would cement the union. What our government has to do is to remember (as it is forced to do in the case of India) that it is the government of a great composite empire, and to determine to avoid the error of Queen Elizabeth,—that error which has cost Ireland so much,—the error of thinking that the thing to be done is to reproduce, at all risks, a second England across St George's Channel. As to "sentimental grievances," why should there be anything in the phrase to excite compassionate scorn? Surely a recent writer is right in reminding us that "national sensibility is an honour, and not a disgrace; that national pride is a thing to be cultivated, not to be trampled out. If Englishmen," he adds, "would remember this, they would be less ready to taunt the Irish with faults which they themselves have fostered, and with a discontent which they themselves do their best to keep alive by their reproaches." We must not be misunderstood, when we speak of Irish nationality as implying that the population is homogeneous. Ireland is, as even the *Times* is beginning to find out, the home of mixed races. There is no such thing as a "Celtic race" pure and simple. The early legends of the country are singularly confirmed by the archaeologists and ethnologists, when they speak of a variety of races, some coming from Scandinavia, others from the south-west, others from the Welsh coast. Fomorian, Firbolg, Tuatha (people)

da Danaan, and Milesian,—these are the chief races named in the legendary history after the disappearance of the antediluvians and giants, who, of course, figure in the very earliest annals. The Gaelic race, say the English ethnologists, was driven westward and northward by the Cymric, Belgic, and Silurian; but, if the Firbolg were Belgæ, as the legend persistently asserts (*Fir* is simply men), the same was not the case in Ireland. For this second wave of population having so overwhelmed the Fomorians as to leave them no independent existence, except in the Isles of Arran, off Galway Bay, is itself broken and driven across into Connaught by the Danaan. We recommend any of our readers who care to study old records under intelligent guidance, to read Sir W. R. Wilde's account of the Battle of Moytura.* In the untouched district between Loughs Corrib and Mask, every cairn still stands almost as it did when (3300 A.M., says the chronicle) the battle was fought; and Sir W. Wilde is able to identify most of the mounds with some incident in that famous four days' fight. Now, these Danaan were, say the latest Irish authorities, Scandinavian. Their name, no doubt, was forged by some senachie who, having a little classical learning, was fond of bringing the king of Greece over to be defeated on Irish ground. Our own annals, those of Hector Boece, and others, may remind how apt the race has always been at literary "inventions." But of their Norse blood Sir W. Wilde, for one, has no doubt. It is a point on which we do not pretend to offer more than a mere opinion. We will only remark, that their having left no trace on the language would be no bar to our accepting this view. The Norseman has always been readier than most people at giving up his own speech, and learning that of those whom he had subdued. We see this, not only in Normandy, but throughout the Highlands, and especially in the Islands. As to the fourth race, Milesians, we are half disposed to think that they were not a distinct race at all, but rather a soldier-caste—the *Milidh*, or Milites—who rebelled against the "Druids" of the sorcery-loving Danaans, and who, by and by, accepted Christianity rather out of spite to their own sacerdotal order. Of course, all this must be conjecture; and the ethnology of Ireland has been for centuries a field for conjecture. Most of us have heard of General Vallancey's dreams, and of his identifying the native Irish with the Punic tongue on the strength of the two or three words supposed to be preserved in the *Rudens* of Plautus. For ourselves, we do not believe the Danaan were Norsemen. We hold that they came in, as the legend says, from the north-east, by the road which the Norsemen travelled later. But, looking to the marked way in which spells and magic of all kinds are con-

* In his *Lough Corrib and its Neighbourhood*.

stantly attributed to them, we hold that they were Finns, driven westward by the movement of the Gothic tribes. This view seems to us borne out by the way in which all the sagas and Norse ballads make charms and sorcery such potent weapons in the hands of the Finns. It would be curious to find that the Danaans' bath of medicated milk, by using which the wounded warriors are immediately healed, is mentioned in Norse legends. But all these are minor points ; our aim is to shew the absurdity of talking of the "Celtic race," and of arguing as though we had to deal with a homogeneous Ireland. "Irish characteristics" are certainly not due wholly, nor mainly, to blood. The coolest blood will wax hot when it has been kept in a ferment for centuries. M. Renan, a shrewd observer, a "Celt" to boot, calls his own branch of the Celtic family a *douce petite race*. Had those Bretons been subject to the influences which have told so powerfully on the Irish, they would have probably been as scatter-brained and restless as our brothers of the sister isle. Look at the list of the "Galway tribes" in Sir W. Wilde's book. There is not an aboriginal Irish name among them. They are Normans, English, Edict of Nantes French. These men, coming in successively, each striving to oust his predecessor, without the least regard to nationality, have kept the island in hot water for centuries, and have (as the traces of old cultivation, the raths, too, and multitudinous enclosures shew) succeeded in many places in turning fertile plains into peat-bogs, varied with stone-covered moors. There is a very great deal of Norse blood in Ireland ; we must not forget that Waterford, from its first foundation, never ceased to be a Danish town ; that Dublin was for centuries a Norse capital ; and that even Limerick, though sometimes sacked by the Irish, was mostly in Danish hands. Yet difference of blood counts for much less in the formation of national character than difference of circumstances. A certain type has been developed in the sister island, with forming which, no doubt, English misrule, and the bad example of lawless colonists, have had as much to do as the crosses of Norse blood. But there the type is, mixed of good and evil, certainly not to be disregarded in its peculiarities by those who would rule the island successfully.

This disregard of Irish peculiarities, and determination to legislate for Ireland as for a portion of England, has been throughout the grand mistake of English statesmen. Even in India, where the differences between the races are more striking, and where our small numbers have made caution necessary, we have constantly fallen into the same error. In the recently published Correspondence regarding the comparative merits of British and native administration in India, will be found many hints more or less directly applicable to Ireland. Mr Mill is

quite right in reminding us that in India we have been obliged always to rule somewhat after Indian ideas ; and yet, increasingly careful as we have been not to offend native prejudices, and to study native ways of thought, we find ourselves sadly deficient in power of appreciating "sentimental grievances." "Better die than live under your Government," said a Sardar to Sir D. Macleod, when his servant, whom he had had taken up on a charge of poisoning his bullocks for the sake of their skins, assailed him with a volley of outrageous abuse ; "there is no other Government under which this could have happened." The poor Sardar longed for a law which, like the Irish Brehon, should give ample redress for outraged feelings. Again, a very worthy Sikh complains, "under your Government there are no rewards." The man is not greedy, he does not want money, but he has a crave for honour, of which he believes Government to be the fountain. "Much harm is done (says Sir D. Macleod) by our Government having in a great measure virtually abnegated this position." It has done the same in Ireland, not virtually but in theory as well—except, indeed, in the case of the constabulary, whom a very limited amount of "honour" has kept exuberantly loyal. The Irishman is like the Hindoo in this,—he would prefer small pay, with frequent presents from Government, to the fixed salary which alone satisfies the Englishman's notions of dignity and propriety. Allowance must be made by wise rulers of a composite nation for these peculiarities of race ; and a good many of those who have lately written on the Irish topic have certainly not been disposed to underrate these peculiarities. Mr Mill, for instance, is accused on all hands of having (in the spirit of a *doctrinaire*) exaggerated them, and of having crystallized into real substance the frothy scum of Irish talk, so often meaningless, so often meaning something quite different from what it seems to mean. We must give a very brief analysis of Mr Mill's pamphlet ; for, whatever we may think of his wisdom in this particular instance, the member for Westminster is one of the few men who have, during the last thirty years, set their mark upon the world of thought. And, first, Mr Mill looks on Fenianism as the most desperate form of disaffection which has ever shewn itself in Ireland. He is quite right in setting less store than many writers do by its foreign affinities. That it thrives in America is a mere accident ; the Yankees, when they do not want the Irish vote, repudiate it just as earnestly as we do. Mr Maguire's book proves that it is not confined to the States, though naturally it has freest development there. The thriving backwoodmen whom he visited in New Brunswick and in Prince Edward's Island—families who had been evicted, and who, *more Hibernico*, laid all the misery of their eviction, and of their after struggles, at the door of the British Government—were certainly

Fenians in spirit, if not in name. But Fenianism could not stand an hour without the broad settled basis of Irish discontent to rest upon. We do not think that anybody who has not lived in Ireland can measure the difference between the two islands in regard to, not exactly loyalty, but kindly feeling between classes. In England there is very little (there never was much) of what still exists a good deal in Scotland, loyalty to the family and to the person of the landlord; but, on the other hand, there is, except among a few extreme men, absolutely no disaffection. The English tenant farmer accepts the existing order of things. He grumbles if times are bad, or rents high, or if he wishes (which he seldom does wish) to vote for somebody who is not the squire's man. But his grumbling is merely the momentary expression of an evanescent feeling. In Ireland there is far less grumbling; Pat is in some things by no means so outspoken as his more cold-blooded brother. The memory of '98, one of the most cruelly repressed rebellions on record, still makes a great many very chary of saying much. You may live in the country for months, and scarcely hear a word which will not seem to you referable to usual "Irish whine." But if once you get at these people who seem so satisfied, you find that under the sunny exterior there is a settled gloom of discontent, very different from the Englishman's occasional grumble. The Irishman thinks, and justly, that nothing goes right with his country, that the country which has undertaken to manage it has, up till quite recently, fearfully mismanaged it. He feels that Ireland is (despite illusory statistics*) not thriving at all in the same proportion as the rest of the empire. He naturally asks himself why, and his answer is pretty much what Mr Mill has formularised in his pamphlet—because England has insisted on applying to Ireland a set of land laws which are certainly not of general application, and which even in England only gain not veneration, but, at best, "ungrudging obedience," because they are rooted in the traditions and oldest recollections of the English people. Mr Mill recognises the power on the Irish mind of that Brehon law of which we spoke, which was the law of the Irishry quite up to James I.'s time. "In the moral feeling of the Irish people, the right to hold the land goes as it did at the beginning, with the right to till it." The great objection to Mr Mill's scheme seems to us its unfairness to those who do not happen at the moment to be tenant-farmers. Tying up the land in the hands of the present holders would certainly not cure the Fenianism, of a communist type, which is rife in the towns. Still, Mr Mill would say that his scheme does not tie up anything, that changes would be constant, and that bad farmers would be much more certainly got rid of than

* See the letter from Mr Fisher of Waterford to Lord Stanley, in the newspapers of 25th January.

under the present system. Another objection, made by every newspaper critic, he meets, though his reviewers have not seen fit to notice his answer to it. The peasant proprietors, say the critics, would instantly begin subdividing, until very shortly all the old "conacre" and overcrowding would begin. No, says Mr Mill, the rent should at the first, be set as high as the land can bear, and then there would be no temptation to sublet; and as for subdivision among families, the French manage that very well; while Ireland, having the bridge ready made to America, would find no difficulty in disposing of a surplus population. Peasant proprietorship would, as a matter of course, involve organised emigration. Again, we are told by Mr Mill's critics that the Irishman is innately and incorrigibly idle, and that all legislation must proceed on the supposition of his idleness. As Lord Russell expresses it:—"Even a plan which, without violating the rights of property, proceeds on the supposition that Irish tenants are what they are not, and that they will do what they will not, ought to be rejected." No, says Mr Mill, you have no right to argue from the bad hopeless past to the hopeful future which fixity of tenure would open out to him. Certainly Irishmen out of Ireland work as hard as any men in the world; Mr Maguire gives repeated instances of how their perseverance is constantly crowned with success in the American backwoods. Then there is the often-quoted instance from Arthur Young, of the beggar who, having a lease granted him, turned a waste hill-side into a thriving garden; and again, there is the case of Kilkee, a remarkable piece of improvement, wholly wrought by tenants at will, in full hope that as soon as the head landlord (the Marquis of Conyngham) came into possession, he would deal honourably with them, and allow due compensation. They were cruelly disappointed. Their case is before the world, and the writer of this paper can vouch that Mr Mill has not stated it one iota too forcibly.*

Security, whether as owner or tenant, would make the Irish tenant a different being. For hitherto, as Mr Mill so justly says, "Alone of all working people the Irish cottier neither gained anything by industry and frugality, nor lost anything by idleness and reckless multiplication." His inference is that, if he was secured in his holding, *so long as he paid a fair rent*, this reckless being would become transformed into a steady hard-working cultivator, a meet rival of the Belgian or the Lothian farmer. The weak point here is that, at present, the Irish farmers who have long leases, or who hold in perpetuity, are just about the average, and that is all.

* See, in Mr Malone's pamphlet, the account of the evictions, Christmas 1862, conducted with a cynicism to which there is no parallel, except in the conduct of that old French aristocracy, which neither feared God nor regarded man.

They are certainly not (as the *Times* with ready flippancy asserts) *the worst of all*; but there is no such striking difference between them and rest as to warrant the conclusion that Mr Mill's fixity of tenure would at once bring about a restitution of all things. He himself sees the difficulty, and in a note remarks that "such farmers would not long stand the test of being held strictly to payment of the full amount of what is now a fair rent. They would soon either change their habits, or *give place to others*." The fact is, when things have got into a bad state, any change for the better must almost inevitably involve instances of individual hardship. Irish farmers at long leases do not farm so well as those in several parts of Scotland, and in the best counties of England (Northumberland, for instance, where long leases, unshackled by antiquated covenants, are becoming the rule; they farm much better, be it remembered, than the average of Essex farmers). It is not because of their long leases that they do not farm better, but because the general insecurity of tenure has brought about a low type of farming (to use a medical term) all through the country. Owing to this insecurity, it is not the custom to spend more on the land than is absolutely necessary; and the Irish farmer, who holds in perpetuity, is unhappily (like the rest of us) too much a creature of custom. Make security the rule, instead of the exception, and then, we may fairly conclude, it will become the rule to put money freely into that "bank" which is sure to give a far larger interest than the banks in which the Irish farmers now hoard their savings. We do not think Mr Mill makes enough of this point; possibly he takes too low a view of Irish agriculture, which in many parts (especially in the south-east) need not fear a comparison with that of the sister island. Anyhow, it is clear that not the exceptional security, but the general listlessness brought about by normal insecurity, has prevented Irish farmers with fixed tenure from doing what an outsider might expect from them. But, an English estate agent may say, why all this talk about leases? A great deal of English land is very well farmed at a rack rent. Scotland has been made the wonder of the agricultural world without fixity of tenure. True, but there has been security in Scotland and England. The two, security and fixity of tenure, do not necessarily go together. Public opinion, community of interests, hereditary good feeling, these better considerations have generally secured the Scotch or English tenant in his holding, so long as he was worthy of holding it. Besides, in England, the cry for increased security is loud and strong. The *Mark Lane Express* is always pleading the cause of the tenant-farmers in this respect; the *Farmer* (almost wholly a Scottish paper) attributes the disgracefully backward state of agriculture in some

of the "home counties" to the want of leases, coupled with the growing sense of insecurity from the fact that land near London is more subject to competition, and is more likely to be taken up for "improvements." In Ireland, none of the above conditions of *security without leases* have existed. The great want of Ireland,—a want which, as we have shewn elsewhere, affects not agriculture only but almost every "Irish difficulty," is a good, wholesome public opinion. A landlord who behaved in Great Britain as Irish middlemen have been too much in the habit of behaving in the interests (?) of absentee landlords, as many of the resident landlords, recklessly blind to their own interests, have behaved, would simply be unable to hold up his head at any county gathering. In Ireland, where there is not "salt" enough to keep public opinion sweet, the State must step in, and insist on the enactment of such rules as shall keep it decently salted. The class that, over here, keep up the standard of public opinion has, unhappily, always been very feebly represented in Ireland. The later English immigrants, who form, perhaps, the bulk of the proprietary, who (at any rate), by their vehemence set the tone to the rest, have never ceased to look on themselves as an army of occupation in a conquered country; too often they have been sadly prone to act in the spirit of the Corcyraean notables, who used to make oath, "I will be evil-minded towards the demos, and will counsel all the ill I can." It is a terrible thing to think of, but in Ireland we have a clear case of the house divided against itself. In other countries, landlord and tenant might be trusted, in the vast majority of cases, to work together for their own mutual benefit, and for the common weal. In Ireland, the case has often and often been nearly as bad as that of the Neapolitan kingdom, described in Burbidge's striking poem, where the owner, living away in Paris, writes—

"Yes, raise the rents, good steward, and do not spare the land :
Gold, gold is of no country ; get gold—you understand."

and so, just as Burbidge describes the wealth of the Two Sicilies, sucked out

"To fat the stubborn English clays or arid sands of France,"

has it too much been with Ireland. The landlord has not cared to fulfil his duties nor to encourage the tenant to fulfil his. At one time, when a seat in the Irish House was a prize worth fighting for, and when, therefore, faggot votes were valuable, many landlords deliberately turned their estates into warrens for breeding voters, whom (since the Union has introduced a new order of things) they have been turning off without the slightest compunction. Community of interest has, indeed, been the exception between Irish landlord and Irish tenant; and never have their interests been more really severed than in the days when, for the sake of influencing elections, landlords, who perhaps never visited their estates

except for electioneering purposes, or who had grown (as men do grow) to look on misery and degradation as the normal state of the Irish peasant, encouraged a course of conduct which, if they had had the slightest title to be good stewards of their inheritance, they ought never to have allowed. This acquiescence of a whole class of men in the degradation of their dependents, is a remarkable phenomenon, referable partly to race—the Anglo-Saxon has always shown itself hard and unsympathising to those whom it looks on as of different blood; a state of rags and poverty which would be considered pitiable in an Englishman is looked as “quite good enough” for an Irishman—partly to evil legislation and the establishment of a “dominant caste,” which became more and more “dominant” as time went on. Ireland was too far from England to be acted upon by English public opinion; and so Ireland became a sort of Jamaica, in which the contrast seems all the more shocking, because the two parties are the same in colour, in moral aptitudes, and in general intelligence. Of course, all this—the natural tendency of all conquest, especially of Anglo-Saxon conquest—was intensified by the difference of religion. We see plenty of the same feeling in the ancient feud between Highland and Lowland, in the cruel treatment of the Macgregors and other clans, in the old disposition to look on a Highlander as an inferior being. But, besides the very strong, though scarcely acknowledged, infusion of Scotie blood in most parts of the Lowlands, we fortunately had in Scotland the great bond of a common faith, maintained by common sacrifices, after having been secured by common effort. Hence that *hereditary good feeling* which has made leases in Scotland almost unnecessary. The landlord was generally of the same blood as his tenants, he was proud of their welfare; he and they felt themselves integral parts of the same country, which could only thrive in the prosperity of them both; both, moreover, held the truth, and both had striven for the truth, and for it had faced perils and mastered opposition which would have broken down a feebler people. All this was wanting in Ireland—is wanting in Ireland still; though that is of far less importance than its absence just at the time when it was all most happily present in Scotland—at the time when the one nation was hardening into consistence, forming that character which it will now surely retain till the world’s end; while the other was first driven to accept Popery as a counterpoise against Tudor force and Tudor baseness, and was then, as if of *malice prepense*, moved by a course of injudicious treatment, to look on Popery and nationality as convertible terms, and was finally (after 1689), crushed so completely by the horrible Penal laws, that for a long time there seemed no life (beyond the mere animal) left

in it. That Popery has been ingrained (so to speak) in the national heart is Ireland's immense loss, but it is also England's deep disgrace.

This utter disregard of the spiritual wants of the people, has told not on the Irish only but, in more than one case, on immigrants from Scotland. After the siege of Derry, a considerable part of the barony of Inishowen, in Donegal, was left almost without inhabitants; their place was filled by families from the Highlands. The same sort of colonisation took place about the same time in the neighbourhood of Carrickfergus. In the first case, Dr King, Bishop of Derry, sent two Gaelic-speaking ministers, who not only kept the Highlanders together, but added to them a large congregation of Irish. The Carrickfergus men were first ministered to by Mr Duncan M'Arthur, and then by Mr Archibald M'Callum. But all these efforts to speak intelligibly were soon discouraged; and, in 1846, the date of the book from which we have extracted the above,* there was not a Gaelic or Irish speaking minister in the whole north of Ireland.

Of course, there were individual instances in which men strove to wipe off, in their own case, the reproach so justly laid against the Irish Establishment, of neglecting the only means whereby the truth could be made acceptable to those whose spiritual pastors its clergy claimed to be. We may mention Mr Nicholas Brown, rector of Donaghcavey, who, by dint of hard work, thoroughly mastered the Erse tongue, and, *finding the people were wonderfully pleased to hear divine worship in their own language*, he preached, read, catechized, and held cottage lectures in native Irish. This was about 1702. Mr Atkins, of Middleton, county Cork, too, some twelve years later, learned Irish, and used it so successfully, that "*his labours were acceptable*, and that he had a large attendance repeating the prayers in Irish." The subject was mooted in the years 1709 and -10 in the Lower House of Convocation, and a resolution was passed, that "some fit persons be provided and encouraged to preach, catechize, and perform divine service in the Irish tongue, at such times and in such places as the ordinary of each diocese, with the consent of the incumbent of each parish, shall direct." Unhappily, this, like other plans made at earlier dates—Dr Owen's, for instance, during the Commonwealth—proved (in Dr Owen's language) "the business of an unpursued order." The matter was just too late to be brought before Parliament, *and it was never revived*. Well might Bishop Berkeley ask in his *Querist*,—a work from which newspaper writers are fond of culling all that

* "The Native Irish," by Christopher Anderson, Secretary to the Society for Supporting Gaelic Schools in the Highlands and Islands.

seems to tell against the Irish character, never noticing the shrewd blows which he aims at English self-satisfaction—"whether there be any instance of a people being converted in a Christian sense, otherwise than by preaching to them and instructing them in their own language?" (No. 260). Well might he marvel, when he looked over the statutes of Trinity College, Dublin, and read James I.'s letter to the Lord Deputy, in which he requires that "the visitors of this our Colledge of Dublin doe particularlie looke unto and take care of this, that choise be made of some competent number of towardlie young men alredie fitted with the knowledge of the Irishe tongue, and that they be placed in the Universitie, and maintained, and taught, till they be able to catechize the simple natives . . and whenever any livings not of any great value fall void among the meer Irish, these men be thought upon before others, who, for defect of that language, should be able to do little good." Well might the Bishop, meditating on this, conclude that, if the object had been to disgust the native Irish with Protestantism, to alienate them from the truth, and to bind them to Popery by all the ties of patriotism, no more successful method could have been found than that practised by the Established Church. Here, as in other Irish matters, King James is far more clear sighted than any of those who have been so ready to question his wisdom. His plan is not a noble one, it is stamped with pettiness—it is an unworthy compromise. Still, had it been as well carried out as his colonization plan was carried out, we should now have a Protestant Ireland, even as we have a thriving Ulster.

But this, at which so many societies are aiming, is a finality which can only be looked for, if at all, in the very far future. Past chances cannot be recalled; there was, indeed, a time when, contrary to the phrase now in vogue, "Ireland's difficulty was England's opportunity." Henry VIII. and Elizabeth might have made Ireland what it was meant to be,—unhappily they preferred trying to make it a province of England and they failed; and its state to-day is the result of their failure. How thankful all this should make us, that in the Providence of God, Scotland was independent of England during that sixteenth century, which was, all Europe over, an age of peddling and Machiavelism in policy, at the same time that it was one of rapid social growth and industrial development. This growth and development, the Tudor kings of England, by their gross mismanagement, effectually checked in Ireland. The country went back, and has been only slowly recovering of late from blows which, to a less elastic race, would surely have been fatal. At the beginning of Elizabeth's reign, Irish industry throughout the Irishry was thriving. Irish *friezes* were well known in the Flemish markets. O'Donnel

was styled "king of fish" by continental writers, owing to the steady supply which his people poured into Southern Europe. At the end of her reign, the country was as desolate as Judea after an Assyrian invasion. O'Donnel was a broken man, and the whole North was so depopulated, that James was fain to supply the void with his Scotch planters. Well may Mr Froude confess that England's behaviour during this period had deprived her not only of all claim to Irish allegiance, but of all right to attempt to hold the country. But, hopeless as it seems at present to expect that Ireland will become Protestant, this fact of a difference of creed, which has wrought so sadly in producing difference of interests and divergence of sympathy between classes, must never be lost sight of in estimating the reasons why Ireland has fallen back in the social race.

It would be endless work to notice all that the English press has been pouring out on Irish subjects. We must content ourselves with a few remarks on the most important contributions towards a subject which will certainly not be misunderstood for want of guides of all descriptions. The works quoted at the head of this paper will be found worthy the attentive reading of all interested in the matter; but they are far from being all with which the man who studies Irish politics ought to acquaint himself. For instance, there is Mr Goldwin Smith, one of the first English writers who took anything like a fair view of Irish questions, does not go by any means so far as Mr Mill. He advocates not fixity of tenure, but leases and fair compensation. Above all, he would abolish primogeniture, entail, and settlements. Lord Russell deals both with the church and land; and he certainly deserves a patient hearing even from his political opponents. He is evidently above all personal considerations, and his zeal for his party is justified by the history of our relations with Ireland, of which he gives an impartial summary. After the Duke of Bedford's toleration plan had been rejected in 1760 by the Irish Privy Council, nothing was done for Ireland except on the merest compulsion, and in the most ungracious way, till Lord Melbourne came into office; and the intervening period is darkened by that contest for the land which was fought out in England in ruder times, and which has been much more severe in Ireland, because Ireland had not, as England had, a manufacturing outlet. As Judge Battersby, in his recent charge at Armagh, summarised the matter, Ireland was, during the reign of forty-shilling freeholders, the period when, as Lord Russell remarks, Scotland made such wonderful progress, owing to its franchise being set so high that farmers were not disturbed by political worries,—a mere field for the creation of faggot votes, holdings being continually divided with a view to create more voters. Then came the peace, and the first great fall in the value of agricul-

tural produce. The small holders were ruined ; and, despite the wish to keep up a supply of voters, the Subletting Act had to be passed in 1826. Next, in 1832, the Reform Bill, raising the franchise to £10, made dispossession and the massing of small holdings the order of the day. Then the repeal of the Corn Laws gave another death-blow to Irish farming, making it impossible for the small holder to stand his ground, and causing vastly increased evictions. Then came the famine ; and, the potato crop being no longer a certainty, "conacre" and subletting have perforce come to an end, and a small holding will no longer maintain a family even in the way in which Irish cottiers have so long been accustomed to exist. Hence voluntary emigration and wholesale eviction : and hence a bitter feeling against the English Government, which the Irishman, who has known the law only as the instrument of the dominant caste, regards as the primary cause of his sufferings. No doubt the Encumbered Estates Act has done much good ; but still we must not forget that the old Irish proprietors in 1846 had a fearful trial to undergo, and that in many cases they met it nobly, not seldom sharing themselves in the ruin which befel their tenants, only unable to act upon that Scottish plan of helping their tenants to emigrate, because, no rent being paid, their own means were absolutely *nil*. The government was certainly more in fault than the landlords. The arrangements for emigration were fearfully neglected. Mr Maguire gives a fearful picture, taken from American documents, of the state of those who were thrown wholesale on the quays of New York. Not till Mr Vere Foster, far more heroic than the *Pall Mall's* casual, had crossed the sea in the steerage of an emigrant ship, and had seen and suffered from and recorded the horrors of the middle passage, was any serious effort made to keep things in decent order. This, of course, is a cause of heart-burning : the settlers in many parts are but a poor remnant of the thousands who perished—who would not assuredly have been left to perish had they been valuable cattle exported by a private firm. But though emigration has lowered the competition for land, and though the sale of encumbered estates has lessened the number of pauper landlords, the men of the new race are not less greedy—nay, are more anxious to drive a hard bargain with the tenants—than were their predecessors. If agrarian outrage is dying out (committals for it have fallen, says the *Pall Mall Gazette*, from 844 in 1844 and 1845 to 198 in 1861, and to 162 in 1865, and to 83 in 1866), the reason is, that there are fewer to evict. Let those who are dazzled by Lord Mayo's statistics note how Mr Joseph Fisher of Waterford meets all the encouraging statistics of the *Times* and *Pall Mall Gazette*, by saying that there are fewer cabins, not because people are better housed,

but because they are dead or in the workhouse, and that if pauperism has decreased (in Dublin it has notably increased within the last quarter), it is because the paupers are dying out. It gives us a curious idea of how anything may be proved by figures, to see the way in which Mr Fisher deals with the facts which we quote below.

"The total acreage under crops (larger than it was in 1847) has dropped since 1860 from 5,970,000 to 5,460,000, or about 8½ per cent. On the other hand, the yield seems larger, for the total value of 'enumerated crops,' which averaged £25,000,000 in 1860 and 1861, reached £28,300,000 in 1865, and has exceeded £30,000,000 for the last three years. Live stock, too, has increased in value from £28,000,000 in 1851 to £45,440,000 in 1866, and the increase has been a steady one; the numbers, too, have risen in every case—in sheep the rise has been quite wonderful. Linen exports again, reached £6,292,000 in 1862; they were valued at £10,327,000 in 1864. Even Irish railways show a rise in receipts, from half a million in 1851, to a million and three quarters in 1865. And, lest we should think these figures only prove that the middle class is thriving, we are told that wages have risen some 60 or 80 per cent. since the famine; that crime is diminishing—committals, a sure indication of the criminal state of a people, have decreased by one-third within the last six years; and that pauperism has not only decreased by two-thirds since 1851, but even in the last four years (years, we have been made to believe, of growing distress) it has steadily decreased. Finally, emigration has been continuously falling off since 1861; and, while the mud cabins have been reduced from 625,000 in 1841 to 197,000 in 1861; and the 'poor cottages,' which in '41 numbered 574,400, now number only 553,500, the better class of houses have increased from 31,000 to 44,000." In all this Mr Fisher can see nothing but cause for lamentation. Wages, he admits, have risen, but not proportionally with the rise in the necessities of life; cottages have been erased, not rebuilt; a quarter of a million poor are wholly or in part on the rates; half a million have died in Irish workhouses since 1847; there is a real decrease in the value and quantity of the produce of human labour. In all this he is seconded by Mr Denis Heron Caulfield, Q.C., who (in the *Times* of 31st January) says, the cereal crops have fallen off immensely, and the live stock is only more valuable because of the greater price of meat. The three millions of people who have disappeared spent some thirty millions yearly, all which has been lost to the shopkeepers and manufacturers. "In the struggle for existence, Ireland is hopelessly beaten." The professions are thinned; the lawyers (for instance) have fallen off amazingly; county society is vanishing; in most counties there will soon be no inhabitants but

the priest and the peasant. A man who compares this catalogue of woes with Lord Mayo's speech of 10th March, may well doubt whether there is any value in statistics. Rather than attempt to reconcile the irreconcilable, let us look a little more at Lord Russell's pamphlet. His lordship speaks very pertinently about the land question. Three conditions, he thinks, should be fulfilled in the agricultural arrangements of every country. Property must fulfil its duties, and enjoy its rights, the tenants must have security, and the land must be fairly cultivated. None of these conditions (he says) exist in Ireland ; and therefore he thinks some legislation on the subject indispensable. But his lordship goes further, and disposes of the church question. And here we must briefly explain how it is that, while we believe with Lord Russell in the absolute need of security (not necessarily fixity) of tenure, and compensation for improvements, and in the desirableness of some state machinery, such as he proposes, to act (at any rate for a time) as middle term between landlord and tenant, we cannot go along with him in his proposal for endowing popery. It is not that the proportions are unfair : six-eighths for the Romanists, one-eighth for the Presbyterians, and the same for the Establishment, represent nearly enough the numerical strength of the three. It is not that the Irish Church is what it should be : in the first place, it has no title whatsoever to the name ; it is, emphatically, the English Church in Ireland, set up for the convenience of the English settlers, and (as its defenders are constantly telling us) mainly endowed by them with lands forfeited during the troubles which followed their successive settlements. It has never aimed at becoming a national church : as we have shewn elsewhere, it might have made the attempt with very fair prospects of success ; but it steadily declined to do so in its corporate capacity, and its individual members were in general far better pleased to see the helots whom they despised continue to be votaries of an abject superstition, than to find them feeling out after that truth which, in the long run, is sure to make men free in every sense. The supineness of the so-called Irish Church, the total indifference of most landowners to the religious need of those about them, are accounted for on the same principle on which we can alone explain the laws which made it penal to give religious instruction to West Indian negroes, the laws which compelled the first Danish missionaries to sell themselves for slaves, that they might be able to " get at " the people whom their masters purposely kept outside the pale of enlightenment. It was the same in Ireland : the peasant would, thought the " dominant caste," be more easily kept down so long as he was a papist, his religion furnished an excuse for ill-treating him, for vexing *him* with penal laws ; it was, moreover, a badge of inferiority,

and to have seriously aimed at converting him would have been to swamp the "ascendancy," by opening it to the very class to keep out whom was its end and aim. Naturally the results of such a church system have been atrocious. Moore's "Captain Rock," and such like books, shew us the state of feeling which grew up as soon as the Romanists had breathing time after the crushing pressure of the penal laws. The many partial surrenders, the amalgamation of Irish sees, the cutting down of endowments, the tithe commutation—all these, passed under pressure, have not made the great mass of the Irish a whit more friendly towards an institution which, even the few who deny it to be an injustice, are fain to call an anomaly and an absurdity. Still less have they made one convert to what the Irish are sharp-witted enough to recognise as an alien church, which has merely attempted in its old age to turn missionary out of deference to modern public opinion. No doubt the "gentleman in the black coat," as Swift calls him, is a useful person in a place where the landlord is non-resident; no doubt the people trust him and seek his advice, and do not disdain his help. No doubt, moreover, the latest form of Irish disaffection seems to have got beyond such "trifles" as the question of rival churches. But surely for this very reason, in addition to others, it might be well to take account of the feeling of the non-Fenian, the non-disaffected part of the Irish population. We do not think that among educated Romanists there is one, except a *doctrinaire* here and there, who does not feel the Establishment to be a badge of conquest, and does not long to see it overthrown, not because he fears it as a rival to his own creed—many of them believe that Protestantism, unendowed, would be far more powerful than Protestantism clogged with all the anomalies, all the evil memories of the Irish Church—but because it is a sign that, in religious matters at any rate, England has always governed Ireland simply and solely for her own advantage.

Compared with this almost universal feeling, so largely shared by men of all parties in Great Britain, all the strange disproportion of work and pay, of population and endowment, are insignificant.* Yet the facts are startling. We need not quote Mr Godkin, lest he be thought an interested authority. We will only remark, that no one has attempted to disprove his figures, and that those figures are about as remarkable as anything well can be. In the diocese of Killaloe, for instance, where the Bishop gets £3300 a year, and has a ducal palace to live in, there are 88 livings. Mr Godkin shews that each Protestant, children in-

* As Mr Maguire said on the 10th March, "We don't want to know whether the revenues of the Establishment are 500,000 or 700,000 a year, or whether this Dean is too well paid, or that Bishop has but a meagre salary. We want a settlement on the broad grounds of justice and common sense, i. e., we want dis-endowment and dis-establishment."

cluded, costs from £5, 12s. to £3, 13s. a year. In the diocese of Cashel, the annual cost per head is £2, 7s. 3d. The cost is considerably higher in the diocese of Limerick. Even in Meath there are two exceptionally rich livings, without a single Protestant of the Establishment. These are Fercall, worth more than £1000 a year. (The Irish Church Directory gives it at £1468 gross, £997 net. It is in fact a part of the property of the Cootes, a family for many reasons odious to all Irishmen who know the history of their country.) The other living, Drumcree, Mr Godkin values at £1500 a year. He also cites plenty of anomalies in Dublin itself. There are six little parishes in that city, which united only make 111 acres. Then there are sham parishes, like that of St Nicholas within, which, having for sole population prisoners, paupers, and their keepers, maintains two clergymen out of money left "for masses." The testimony of the Irish Church Directory is equally strong, and is of course unquestionable. Facts like the following occur at every page. . . . "Donoughmore, Cloyne diocese, gross value £835, net £700, *church accommodation* (the Directory prudently abstains from naming the actual numbers of Protestants), for 120." "Lisgoold, same diocese, gross £689, net £529, church accommodation for 80." "Derrygalvin, Limerick diocese, gross £1201, net £860, no church whatever." "Cahir, Ardfert diocese, gross £556, net £357, church-room for 60." "Mothel, Lismore diocese, gross £921, net £587, church-room for 40." These are taken at random, indeed more glaring instances of inequality might be found. But every one knows the "Irish Church" has not (as we said) the slightest claim to represent any more than a portion, and, in all except a few anglicised parts, a most insignificant portion of the people. It would not have received even the modified support which it obtained from Dr Cooke and the other Presbyterians at Hillsborough, were not the question of its disendowment sadly complicated by being coupled with schemes for the endowment of popery. By insisting on placing together these two things, not necessarily connected, the liberals have greatly weakened their cause. When the Presbyterians of Ulster protest against a change, they are not agitating for the support of the Irish Church, they are agitating against that which they have been industriously taught must follow its disendowment, viz., the endowment of popery. Of this they have a wholesome dread, the same dread which leads us to give up Lord Russell, as soon as, leaving the land question, he begins to deal with church matters. For the instinct of all Reformed Churches has taught them that popery is something very different from any of the Protestant sects. It must be dealt with as a thing apart, claiming (as it does), to have nothing in common with any other church whatsoever. The widest theoretical toleration is staggered when it comes to deal practically with

popery ; for toleration cannot be all on one side, and Romanist toleration is merely a yielding to the necessities of the time ; her claim to infallibility binds Rome to be, what she has always shewn herself wherever and whenever she has dared to do so, a systematically persecuting church. Suppose Romanism endowed, of course even the most latitudinarian of philosophic liberals would never consent to do this without taking pledges from the Romish hierarchy, and by a concordat or otherwise, establishing such safeguards as he could deem sufficient against that inveterate tendency of the consistent Romanist, to love his faith better than he does his country, and to sacrifice a heretical government for the sake of some supposed advantage to the Romish see. Who can imagine, looking to the world's history, that the pledges would be kept, that the safeguards would be found sufficient ? Rome would respect them just as long as it suited her purpose to do so, and no longer. Her view of the true relative positions of the civil and clerical powers has not changed since the days of Hildebrand ; and, on occasion, the Irish prelates would, as a matter of course, shake off what they would consider fetters unfairly fastened on them, and would strive to put themselves at the head of affairs. *Bonâ fide* endowment, coupled with no matter what conditions and limitations, would be certain to lead to this ; and state-pay without endowment the Romish priests with one voice say they will not accept. Of the Romish laity we have said nothing, for far too little is heard of their wishes. From Mr Whitty's pamphlet, and from the personal observation of those who know Ireland well, we are convinced that even in Ireland, there is an anti-Ultramontane party, strong, not indeed in numbers, but in intelligence ; voiceless, except when it speaks occasionally in a newspaper paragraph (as, recently, in that notable passage in the *Cork Reporter*, which pointed out how papal interference in Ireland has always brought misery) ; anxious, too, for secular education, but kept in the background by reason of that absence of anything like a calm tribunal of public opinion, which prevents moderate men from getting a hearing in Ireland. No wonder this party is weaker in Ireland than in other popish countries. For there, as we have elsewhere shewn, love of country, and hatred of gospel truth, have been bound up together through England's sad and sinful mismanagement. If, as we know, men like the Abbe Michon, anxious to save popery by thoroughly reforming it, are in a very small minority even in France, how should we expect to find them numerous in Ireland ? Yet, few as they are, it would be sad to sacrifice these men, the hope of Ireland's religious future, to Dr Cullen and his coadjutors. To endow popery, above all, now that extreme views are in the ascendant, would be just to deliver up all men of broad and enlightened views, bound hand

and foot, into the grasp of the Ultramontanes. It would be to sacrifice the rising generation, and to condemn them to a narrower creed than that of their fathers. And this would not only be done by the direct endowment of popery, but by the appropriation of the Church revenues to educational purposes, unless care was taken that education should be really secular. And the loss to the United Kingdom from such a change would be immense. A thoroughly Ultramontane Ireland would be at least as troublesome as an Ireland full of Fenians. We should at once be bound to a certain line of foreign policy, our daring to depart from which would be the signal for a crusade, like that which all who look into the Romanist newspapers know that Rome is carrying on, unscrupulously and just as if patriotism was a mere word with no idea to correspond to it, against the kingdom of Italy. For this reason, we cannot vote for the endowment of popery. Disendow the establishment, wholly if you please, trusting to the voluntary system, which should answer here if anywhere, seeing that the Protestants of the establishment include the great bulk of the rich proprietors; trusting, too, to help from England, which ought to support "the English Church in Ireland" on the same principle on which its Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts does so much in support of its Colonial churches. Or, if you will, reserve a portion of the revenues of the Establishment; cut down the enormous wealth of the bishops and cathedral clergy; redistribute what funds you reserve; carefully weed out anomalies; let there be no more fat livings in which the only sign of Episcopacy is a ruined gable-end, with perhaps a mullioned window, standing amid a shamefully ill-kept churchyard which the country people round still regard with special reverence. But whatever you do, be sure you employ every penny which you take from the Establishment for purely secular purposes. Now these, of course, are mainly education, public works, State countenance to manufactures, and (for those who are enthusiasts about peasant proprietorship) government help, in the way of loans from State-banks (such as Mr Bright would found, for the sake of the 540,000 tenants who, he says, would fain be proprietors), to tenants who are anxious to buy their holdings.

Of these, Lord Russell tells us, we must not think of fixing on education, or we shall lose the Government grants already made for that object. We cannot see the force of this objection. There is surely educational work enough in Ireland to call for both the present State allowance, and a portion of the revenues of the Establishment. At a recent meeting of the Presidents of the Queen's Colleges, the contrast as to education between Ireland and Scotland was well pointed out. The colleges fail, not solely from Ultramontane opposition, but also from

the want of any good intermediate schools. In the whole province of Connaught, said Dr M'Cosh, are not 709 fairly-educated boys, while twenty per cent. of the students at Edinburgh come up from parish schools, and the proportion is higher at our other universities. The few Irish endowed schools—those of James I. and Dr Erasmus Smith—have been grossly abused. We may find their masters advertising the fact that they take no foundationers—*i.e.*, that they have wholly given up the purpose of their foundations; and so the poorer Irishman, despite a national system admirable in many points as far as it goes, is far less educated than the Scot of the same social rank; and this not from any carelessness about learning, for both nations share alike that honourable love of letters, which makes the cottier submit to any hardship for the sake of giving more learning to a bookish son, but solely for want of those opportunities which among us are within everyone's reach. There are plenty of ways, then, of expending moneys, in founding one or more national universities* with bursaries and the like, and in keeping up in almost every parish a good intermediate secular school, and here and there throughout the island a well-managed agricultural school. In this way we should be getting rid of the great argument against disendowment—that in a country which suffers so much from absenteeism, you remove those who in many parts are the only resident gentry, for it would replace the “civilisation of the State clergyman” by greater civilising forces, free from all association with injustice and foreign domination. Nor do we think special branches at all beneath the consideration of a Government really anxious to put Ireland into the same position as that which Scotland has so long held with reference to England. Few wish to preserve as spoken tongues the remnants of Gaelic speech; but that is no reason why the voluminous and really valuable Irish literature should be left to the care of amateur professors, and to the advocacy of men like Mr Matthew Arnold. It is a reproach to the Government that so little has been done in this way,—most of that little having moreover been since undone,—that men like Eugene O'Curry, the last of a hereditary band of expositors, was suffered to struggle with crushing poverty through the greater part of a life which (had it been made less hard) might have been so much more precious to us, who know not where to look for his successor. The Gaelic books named at the head of this

* Surely not such an university as Lord Mayo proposes, and of which the *Times* (March 12) justly says, “with its senate of none but Roman Catholic prelates, it resembles no institution not only in the United Kingdom, but even in the more advanced Romanist countries.” Such a foundation would indeed be a sad step backwards.

article,—few indeed,* considering the relative value of the literature, compared with the Anglo-Saxon “leechcrafts” and the twaddling monastic chronicles each borrowed from the other,—suffice to shew that there is plenty of work for more than one “professor of Celtic.” That Brehon law, perhaps the first non-Roman code which was systematized in Europe, is in itself a deeply interesting study, throwing some unexpected light on early Celtic habits, and showing us moreover how it comes to pass that Irish notions about land-law are so irreconcilable with those of English statesmen. When we read the Brehon, we see that Whiteboyism, Molly Maguire, and many other forms of agrarian discontent, were simply rough protests against the injustice of land-tenure, as by English law established, and in favour of the native way of viewing the matter. Dr S. Ferguson, too, of the Irish Record Office, has lately been telling us that in this *Senchus Mor*, he finds traces which lead him to suspect that Celtic law lies at the bottom of that English common law, which is usually so unhesitatingly claimed as of purely Teutonic origin. “Read this Brehon law, and study it, ye statesmen (says M. d’Lasteyrie in a paper in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*) if you would understand aright the riddle of Irish character; if you would be able to enter into the aspirations of a people so thoroughly distinct from you in their way of looking at things.” There is wisdom in this advice, and a chair of Celtic law and history would be just the thing to give our literary classes a general acquaintance with that branch of the national literature of which all of us, except a few enthusiasts, have hitherto been profoundly ignorant.

As to public works, Lord Russell makes the same remark, that if Church revenues are used for them, existing Government grants will be lost. There is surely no need that it should be so, Ireland has been so long neglected (despite the large amount frittered away in jobs) that there is plenty of such work to swallow up all the funds ever likely to be available. Politicians who object to spend public money on great public works (like Mr Gladstone, who instances the failure of the Galway contract, and Earl Grey, who brings forward the *fiasco* of the Caledonian Canal), fail to prove their point when they come to a matter like arterial drainage or Shannon or Suck embankment. The state of this latter river is a disgrace to a civilised country. Works of this kind are less practicable without State help in Ireland than anywhere else, for the proprietors are still very generally embarrassed, the tenants will not bring out their money till they feel secure in their tenures, and there is no rich mercantile body to form companies and do the work, as

* Two only, out of the whole of the Rolls Series: one in a special Irish series, of which more are promised.

similar works are being done in Lancashire and elsewhere. Besides, the genius of the people is in favour of State help. As in France, they get on much better when Government gives the initiative ; and, if we are to govern Ireland more satisfactorily for the future, it might be as well to take the genius of the people a little into account. Former failures, former "jobs," only teach us that great care is necessary in this matter of State aid.

Besides, we owe Ireland a debt ; and one way, perhaps the readiest, of trying to pay it, is to give her for a time more than her share of army contracts, arsenals, dockyards, and the like, besides the help (of which we spoke) towards righting herself in her struggle with nature, and with her too abundant rain-supply. State countenance to manufacturers will, we fear, alarm the political economist. It is going back to the abandoned principles of protection. Well, be it so : why not give up supply and demand, if a part of the empire seems to require artificial help ? England can stand alone ; Ireland, as a manufacturing country, is in the position which England held some century and a half ago, when she was (be it remembered) the most fiercely protectionist power in Europe. How she "protected herself" against Ireland is (we suspect) known to but few.* Lord Dufferin exposes admirably "England's restrictive policy," and points to Belfast as a sufficient answer to the charge that the Irish never succeed as manufacturers. "This is the only instance in which we have been allowed a chance of success. Surely it is but fair to argue from our success here that we should have done equally well in other parts, and in other industries, had it not been for the cruel way in which other industries were closed to us." We recommend Lord Dufferin's pamphlet to all who would learn the true history of the decay of Irish manufactures. Scotland felt a good deal of England's repressive policy in the years immediately preceding the Union ; it was happy for Scotland that she got the Union, and therewith political equality, before the break up of the clan system and the growth of modernism, before (that is) her efforts at trade and manufacture had begun to be seriously made.

And now, in summing up, we must remind our readers that it is not our province to suggest remedies ; still, we cannot help drawing our own conclusions from the mass of facts and statements which have been for the last six months showered upon the public, and a good many of which we have striven to collect and arrange. As to the land, we think Lord Russell is right in arguing against agrarian schemes. Make (we would

* As Mr Mill happily expresses it, in his speech of March 10, "if Ireland is the sister island, she has certainly been always treated like a Cinderella."

say) as little exceptional legislation as possible : some you owe to Ireland, as a set-off against the former exceptional legislation of which she was the victim ; but we believe it best to leave things in great measure alone, only relieving the tenant at once, by giving compensation for unexhausted improvement, and by encouraging leases, from a competition which must always be fierce in an agricultural country. In a late debate in the House of Lords, the Earl of Clanricarde said that all through the west the rent had never been collected so easily as during the past year, while the law lords and Lord Kimberley enlarged on the legal and economical difficulties of any sweeping change. It is very generally felt that, although there is a great deal to say for Mr Mill's *petite culture*, it would be better to give Ireland a turn of tranquillity first, to try the effect of a short term of quiet, like that between Smith O'Brien's attempt and this Fenian outbreak. If, during the next twenty years, the country improves at anything like the rate of improvement during that period, it will have attained a condition in which it will be independent of remedies, heroic or otherwise. If, on the other hand, its state is still unsatisfactory, anyhow our little troubles with the United States will be settled before then, and in legislating for Ireland we shall not be suspected of at all yielding to pressure from without. We are not averse to exceptional legislation in exceptional cases : we think many things ought to be done for Ireland which are quite against the principles of supply and demand ; but we have very little faith in schemes for free trade in land, we have watched the working of the Encumbered Estates Act, and we do not think it all necessarily follows that a new purchaser will be a kinder or a more improving landlord. The great Martin property in Connemara has been left by the Law Life Company almost wholly unimproved : after a little work at the outset, they have not only done nothing themselves, but have resisted every attempt at joint action, opposing the Oughterard Railway, the Lough Corrib Canal, &c. Mr Maguire, too, gives a case in point. It was "a fine Catholic gentleman with an old Galway name," who, newly coming into some land, had turned off the most hardly-used of all the families, whose complaints Mr Maguire listened to in the backwoods. So long, in short, as the modern theory of land is pretty generally accepted, so long will land be considered "property," and will be treated like other investments. And hence, whoever may be landlord, there will be occasional hardships in the tenancy, which the most paternal government cannot do more than mitigate. Those who think Mr Mill's case so clear that nothing is to be said on the other side, we advise to read M. About's *Le Progrès*, and the *Scenes from French Clerical Life* by Ferdinand Fabre. In both they will see how large a minority of peasant proprietors

get indebted to such an extent, as to leave the money-lenders virtual owners. If men could go back to the old clan system of constant redivision, according to the needs of the little community, or if Christianity had become practically the rule of everyday life, so that land-owners looked on themselves as stewards, then there would be room for Utopian theories, or rather, they would be needless, because practice itself would be Utopian.

In a theological review we might reasonably go up very high into the question about the nature of trusts, and inquire, why and wherein the possession of land differs from all other trusts? but we have endeavoured throughout to tie the discussion down to social and economical issues, and to ask, not what is abstractedly the highest right, but which will do most good of the plans which are feasible under existing circumstances?

So, again, on the Church question, we have no wish to prescribe impossibilities. We cannot acquiesce in the endowment of Popery, or (which would soon come to the same thing) of education controlled by the Popish priesthood. Neither can we help feeling that the Protestant Establishment in its present form is a just ground of offence. Wrong in its beginning, it has been wrong throughout; it deserted its trust, and could not now complain if its candlestick were to be wholly taken out of its place. This will not be: the English Church in Ireland will still be maintained, not as Lords Ellenborough and Hardwicke (clinging to the bad old phrase)-called it the other day, as "our advanced garrison" in Ireland, but as a witness for the truth amid Popish darkness,—not as part and parcel of that "ascendancy" which has done such measureless evil, but as a reminder of the good old days when (even on M. de Montalembert's showing) the Patrician and Columban faith was so widely different indeed from nineteenth-century Romanism. We have no desire to be uncharitable; but, looking to European history as a whole, we cannot deny that Popery has been (what every Protestant would feel *à priori* that a religion of lies must be) a hindrance to those countries which have adopted it. Popery is the proximate cause of a good deal of Ireland's backwardness. If the priests have done much, as we believe they have, to keep alive a noble spirit among the peasantry, to prevent them from falling into the mental degradation which in some counties marks the English labourer, they have done this not as priests, but, in spite of their being teachers of error, as the only educated class, the only men whom the people in many places had to look up to. *Soggarth aroon* would not have been less dear, and would certainly have been more valuable as a friend and counsellor, had he taught gospel truth about the highest things. And of all the reasons which Ireland has for hating England's rule, none is so reasonable as that drawn

from the fact that England rivetted the chains of Popery round necks which would else have surely shaken them off. This is the most grievous wrong which England did to Ireland,—that, as if of deliberate purpose, she made Protestantism (at the time when minds were open and hearts were stirring, in Ireland as elsewhere, with the breath of young truth which was moving all Europe) utterly unacceptable, nay hateful, to Irishmen, and wrought in the Irish mind such a confusion of ideas, that Popery (of all religions the most unnational, the most destructive of true national sentiment) has actually got to be regarded as the national faith.

Why this conduct on the part of Elizabeth and her counsellors? Had they, with that Machiavelian craft, which rendered them so powerful for evil, insight enough to see that a Popish Ireland would be far more easily held down by England than an Ireland which the truth had made free? Certain it is, that to any really national Irish movement Rome has always been felt to be a hindrance rather than a help. Philip II. sacrificed Ireland, and the English Catholics as well, to his jealousy of France. The Pope would not transfer Ireland (of which he claimed the disposal) to Spain, for he hoped to get it for Mary Queen of Scots. Neither of them had the slightest care for Irish nationality; their sole aim was to secure the island to the Popish cause. The way in which Philip countenanced that miserable adventurer Stukeley (really a spy in Sydney's pay), whom he recognised as "Duke of Ireland," is a proof of his utter disregard of Ireland's true interests. O'Donnel might break his heart at Rome, O'Neil might plead in vain for the help so often promised, but a creature like Stukeley, who was a Papist only, and not a national chief, carried the day at the court of the Escorial before them both. So, later, when Ormond's action for Charles I. assumed national proportions, the first thing the Earl of Clanricarde and the confederates did was to drive out Rinuccini, the legate, as a necessary preliminary towards making a *bona fide* stand. This is the great reason why Fenianism seems to us more dangerous than it would otherwise be. It has been steadily opposed by even the most anti-English of the priests, and will certainly not be given up because a change in ultramontane tactics may transform the negative loyalty of men like Dr Cullen into hearty co-operation with Government. But while there is present danger in this, there is hope for the future. Protestantism has not hitherto had a fair chance in Ireland. At the first, instead of a John Knox, it had men like Brown and Loftus to "establish" it. It was established by force of arms, by legal ordinance, just as the Stuarts strove to set up Episcopacy in Scotland, by every means, in fact, except the preaching of the Word in a tongue understood of the people. Fenianism has given a

great blow to priestly influence; surely we may hope that, when the offence of the Establishment is removed, Irishmen will be led to compare the truth which has been kept from them with the error in which they have been trained up. Then, assuredly, a change will come. We do not mean that Ireland will ever become Presbyterian or Anglican,—certainly not the latter. The church, so many of whose prelates have been men like Narcissus Marsh, “the beauty of holiness,” and like Agar, the dabbler in leases, can never commend itself to those who know anything of their country’s history; but we do think that, in God’s providence, its people will be led to develope for themselves a form of Christianity free from all vital error, as national as was the Gallican Church in its best days, and far purer in creed. This is what the best educated of the Romish laity are aspiring after; they are, unhappily, far too silent a body (except some letters in the *Southern Reporter*, and Mr Whitty’s pamphlet on education, we have not met any printed expression of their views), but the impending downfall of the temporal power will open the way for national churches, more or less reformed. The certainty of this accounts for the tenacity, so puzzling to High-Church Anglicans, with which the Romanists cling to the idea of a pope-king. Moreover, in America, if the Synod of Baltimore means anything, there is (despite Mr Maguire’s assertions to the contrary) a perceptible loosening of the shackles of popery, which may, with God’s help, lead to complete freedom.

Of the material evils which spring from popery, nobody who has had much to do with Irish people can doubt. That very unsatisfactory form of fatalism which destroys efforts is directly due to a creed which assures its votaries that they alone of all human beings are sure of God’s final rewards. Often, when urging on Irish labourers the duty of economy, of care for their children’s future, &c., we have been met with the reply, “Sure, and it matters little what happens to any of us here; we have the faith, and we’ll be all right hereafter!” It is the feeling of the Italian lazzaroni, of the Spaniard who is content to live poor in the garden of Europe. It was the feeling of the French peasant before the Revolution shattered the power of the priesthood, and broke the spell which had kept that great nation in such a backward state. Smiles’s *Huguenots* has lately reminded us of a good deal which most writers, in this falsely “literal” age, are fond of putting out of sight; and any one who wishes to get fresh evidence on this point should look through *Les Paysans*, the last of the Erckmann-Châtrain famous series of novels. He will there see how mendicancy, idleness, and degradation of all kinds were in old France the immediate fruit of “the teaching of the church.” A book published last summer, called “Irish Homes and Irish Hearts,” written by an English pervert in order to glorify

Irish Romanism, gives a glowing account of what it calls "that marvellous network of religious institutions spread over the land, and those surpassing deeds of charity which, in reality, form a powerful element in Irish life." The writer does not tell us at what a sacrifice of material progress all these nunneries, and brotherhoods, and the like are kept up. The loss is two-fold. Energetic members of the middle class—Ireland's greatest want—are withdrawn wholesale from the world's work, and money, too, is locked up to an extent which the author's figures shew to be very considerable. But enough on a point which none except Romanists and a few *doctrinaire* liberals will contest. We have already asked the question, why is the Highlander so thoroughly different from his first cousin in the sister island? Whatever effect independence, a native aristocracy, the absence of aggravating and offensive strangers, &c., may have had in elevating the Highlander, it is certain that religion is mainly answerable for the difference between the two.*

Hence, in any appropriation of the funds of the Establishment to educational purposes, it will be necessary to strictly guard against priestly interference. Mr Mill is quite right in calling the establishment of a Catholic University "a sacrificing the best thing in Ireland (education), in order to save the worst (the Establishment)." Such an university would be a gross anachronism; and, to escape it, we would devote the money (not so large as some of us think, when necessary claims have been met) to the encouragement of Irish manufactures, the carrying on of public works, the promotion of those many objects which, in a poor country, our nursery for soldiers (let us remember), as well as our cattle-farm, can never fail to present themselves. We do not think that the grand question between free-trade and protection need be brought forward, when it is proposed to give Government help to Irish manufactures. Here is the case of a country beaten out of the field by exceptional legislation, and therefore having a prior claim for exceptional measures in the other direction. Irish manufactures were deliberately crushed in the days when the Birmingham Chamber of Commerce was ready to impeach Pitt for wishing to establish something like trade equality. Irish manufactures must be dealt with now as Colbert dealt with those of France. The fallacy that you cannot create a manufacture has been exposed, often and often, by Sir A. Alison and others. Keep up a good supply, and a demand is sure to arise. England having protected her own manufactures up to greatness, now kicks down the ladder, and cries out for free-trade everywhere and in all things. It would rather be her

* See "Observations on the Character, Customs, &c. of the Irish." By Daniel Dewar. 1812. A very interesting work, deserving to be re-edited, with additions up to the present time.

wisdom, in dealing with Ireland, to prop up the sister country for a while till she shall, so to speak, have "found her manufacturing legs." Of course, in any attempts to organise Irish manufactures, a great deal may be done, and ought to be done, by the Irish people. It is partly because there is no Irish people, because popery and the "dominant caste" between them have substituted for an united nation a mass of discordant fragments, that Irish manufactures have been so poorly developed. The nonsense which is written about the want of coal and iron can only deceive those who know nothing of the proportion which the price of those substances bears to the price of labour,—always so cheap in Ireland. It is absurd to pretend that anywhere in Connemara, for instance, where water-power is abundant, the extra cost of freight of raw material would at all counterbalance the saving in wages. Why cotton-mills should succeed in Lancashire and Lanarkshire, and should not be even attempted in Galway, is explicable enough when we look at past circumstances, but does not depend on any inherent fitness in the one place, or unsuitability in the other. Galway is nearer the cotton, if Manchester is nearer the coal. But, as we said, Irish factions have allowed their manufactures to droop, while they were struggling each in its own petty quarrel. If the Government may with advantage use Irish frieze more extensively in clothing our soldiers, surely the priests might shew their patriotism by determining to wear nothing but home-made broadcloth. This would at once give an impetus to production. Unhappily, agitators, lay and clerical, have always been fonder of urging grand Utopian schemes than of contenting themselves with the humbler, but more useful, work of encouraging native industry; while the mass of the nation, taking its tone from "fashionable" (*i.e.*, Anglo-Irish) society, has always gone to England for everything importable,—necessaries as well as luxuries. The very products of Irish farms are often sold under English names, because "the quality," moved by a spirit which a Scotchman must find it hard to understand, think everything English must be, as a matter of course, better than what their own country produces. Their own country! Who does not know how persistently the later English settlers refused, and still refuse, to identify themselves with the native. "I'm a Tipperary girl, if you please, but I'm not an Irishwoman," said to us, this very year, a young lady whose grandfather was English, her grandmother Scotch. On their nationality she relied for exemption from "the Irishry." Because there are, and have been, so many like her, therefore, not only are the Irish manufactures behindhand, but the Irish nationality is left for Dublin shop-boys and Limerick roughs to drag through the mire of Fenianism. To any Irish gentleman who **really** loves his country, and desires to see her freed from pre-

sent evils, we would say: "Be national. You talk glibly about the best thing for Ireland being to take her place along with Kent or Cornwall. It is a grave question whether that would be the best thing; but, whether or not, neither you nor any man can compass such a result. Here is the crave for nationality; if the better part of the nation join in satisfying it, it will be satisfied decently, as it has been in Scotland. If they stand aloof, the mob will very naturally run into strange vagaries. But whether guided or left to themselves, the Irish will have that nationality which is the heritage of every distinct people, and of which, at this age of the world, no wise government will attempt to deprive them."

But, though Irish help is essential to the success of Irish manufactures, there is one direction in which government help is sorely needed, and in which nothing but government help can be of any real service. Arterial drainage is the great want of Ireland; no thorough draining can be done till it is accomplished; the landlords will never combine in such a work; indeed, with the best intentions, they could hardly compass that unity of plan which is essential for every great artery. There is no reason why the work should not be begun at once, for the government surveys and valuation afford just the data that are wanted. The work would pay; it would raise wages, which still in winter do not range, except near the great towns, above 1s. a day, so that a man must (at present prices) work two days to get one day's food for himself and wife and four children; it would, moreover, be necessarily supplemented with embankment works along rivers, which, like the Suck, are (as has often been said) "a disgrace to any civilised country," with canal works, &c. Here is a ready way of spending all the church moneys which are likely to come in for a long time. The greater portion of them might be funded, and the interest applied both to keep up the works and to pay off loans for construction which should at once be made out of the imperial treasury. In this way a positive work would be done far superior to any of the Utopian schemes of those who, with the best intentions, would make Ireland a *corpus vile* for social experiments. In this way too the great mass of the people, who desire nothing better than to live in quiet and security, would see that government was at last determined to do, and not merely to talk. They would get just that "initiative" which the Celtic nature is said to want; and there would be some chance of that consummation being realised, of which Lord Russell speaks thus in his closing paragraph:—

"The English have the most perseverance, the Scotch the most sense, the Irish the most generosity. But all these nations, speaking one language, living in two islands closely connected, governed by a mixed race of Norman, Saxon, and

Celt, are destined to form, as they have formed, through dangers, convulsions, and disasters, a community—or, if you will, an empire, distinguished by its high spirit, its freedom, and its civilization. Let us only add *Hibernia Pacata* to our victories of peace, and the future may exceed the past.”

We are glad to believe that *Hibernia Pacata* may be the triumph of a government with Mr Disraeli at its head. That statesman has only so to “educate his party” that they shall realise the crying injustice of the Establishment, the exceptional need, in a purely agricultural country, of protection to the tenant, and the claim of Ireland on Government-support to counterbalance the unfair treatment which she received in past times. Let these three ideas be impressed on Parliament, and let it also feel the need of acting at once, and all will yet be well.

There is no excuse for inaction. The British people is thoroughly moved. Never has so much been written on any subject, in so short a time, as on this Irish topic since Fenianism broke out in an aggravated form. Amid much wild talk, much light must also have been thrown upon questions of which even educated Englishmen have hitherto been content to be singularly ignorant. We, to whom Irish matters have been familiar from boyhood, have been constantly astonished to find how little information very many men of intelligence and culture have upon them. As Mr W. Arnold says of Celtic literature, Irish history, Irish antiquities, everything Irish, except the common misleading talk of newspapers, has hitherto been for most Englishmen as though it was not. For this ignorance no one can in future plead want of information; enough has been said on every point to enable all to form a judgment who possess in any degree the judicial faculty.

Our own object has been rather to state facts than to draw inferences. We had intended to enter at some length into the history and antiquities of Ireland, and to discuss the character of its people, and its climatic and geographical peculiarities. These points we hope to return to in another paper. Mr Mill, Mr Goldwin Smith, and Earl Russell have, for the present, kept us to graver topics. Gravest of all the points which we have mooted is the case of the Established Church, which we hope the present Parliament will not hesitate to deal with. We have already said that the Church of England in Ireland should (in our view) be to a great extent maintained by English money; it is not in any sense a national church. This would, of course, involve a great change in arrangements; the “Irish Church” (as it calls itself) would soon grow a good deal like the Episcopal Church in Scotland. We should no longer have the anomaly of which Mr Godkin complains, of Archbishop Trench receiving £6000 a year, while Cardinal Cullen has to live on voluntary contributions. And when the govern-

ment had given this earnest of an intention to deal thoroughly with Irish grievances, minds would become calmer and better fitted to consider the more vexed and intricate, though less important, question of the land-tenure.

And if Fenianism shall lead us at last to do away with Ireland's capital grievances, we may well say with Mr Gladstone, "These painful and horrible manifestations may perhaps in the merciful designs of providence—without in the slightest degree acquitting the authors of responsibility—have been intended to invite this nation to greater search of its own heart and spirit and conscience, with reference to the condition of Ireland, and the legislation affecting that country." And such legislation would surely be met by Ireland in a kindly spirit. For, though there is much discontent and some disaffection in Ireland, Lord Mayo is right in reminding us that "there is a very numerous class in the country as patriotic and as attached to our institutions as any class of men in the world. *Their faces are not turned to the West ; they believe that the best hopes of Ireland are mixed up with the British constitution ;* they desire that their sons should be as they and their fathers have been, sharers in your greatness, your glories, and your freedom ; and their best hope for their country is, that the day is not far distant when, not by legislative coercion, but by a more beneficent course on the part of the Government, the whole mass of the country may be brought to acknowledge, and, in acknowledging, to appreciate, the kindly blessings which a free constitution affords to a loyal and united people." Surely these words of Lord Mayo are a pledge that Government does not mean to rest satisfied with the policy of procrastination, and that it will not leave to Mr Bright and Mr Gladstone the work of pacifying Ireland.

Since this paper was written, "An Ulster Presbyterian" has been publishing a series of letters in the *Daily News*. The last of these, which appeared on March 13, so thoroughly confirms what we have said in p. 398, about the absolute need of *security to the tenant*, that we must quote a paragraph from the letter itself. No doubt Ireland needs "patience, not legislative panaceas ;" and Lord Mayo is perhaps justified in seeking by a Commission to "secure a solid basis for any future legislation before he brings in a land law ;" but still a purely agricultural country requires un-English remedies, and the following very emphatic words—all the more emphatic because so temperately expressed—show the feeling in reference to land laws among the men of the north, who (be it remembered) have, despite tenant-right, a good deal to complain of, when the agent sends round a valuator every fourth year to raise their rent, and so makes their famous "custom"—the true child of that Scotch feeling which protests against "*lairds sae sair on*

gear, wha set ane mailin to anither"—a mere mockery. The Ulster Presbyterian says :—

“ Any measure, to be of the slightest use, should, in the first place, give the tenant the full value for all unexhausted improvements made in the last thirty or thirty-five years. It should enable the tenant to make improvements in the future, and should provide that all improvements should be paid for either in money, or by a lease of proportionate length and value.

* * * * *

“ It is a sad comment upon English land-laws that if, in any part of Ireland, there is a town distinguished for energy and enterprise, it will be found on inquiry that the landlord is a pauper, who has been forced to give perpetuities. But there is no reason why Ireland should be impoverished generally to keep the landlord rich, or why the landlords should be destroyed that the people may go free. Surely it is not a hopeless task to reconcile the interests of class with class. If it be too hard for the Parliament of England, it will assuredly some day be taken up by some other body. Suppose for a moment that, remembering how Canada thirty years ago was pacified by a settlement of their land and Church questions, it was decided that Ireland should be allowed to join the present confederation of our North American colonies, does not every man know that the measures I have suggested would be adopted in a more stringent form, and that the result would be within a generation, the contentment of the people, and the growth of a loyal feeling towards the English crown? And can we not make the experiment for ourselves? Can we not try the effects of a little wisdom and a little justice—and justice is only wisdom in action—and seek the happiness of a nation by giving it the opportunity of improvement? ”

VII.—GENERAL LITERATURE.

Leaves from the Journal of our Life in the Highlands, from 1848 to 1861, to which are prefixed and added Extracts from the same Journal, giving an Account of Earlier Visits to Scotland, and Tours in England and Ireland, and Yachting Excursions. Edited by Arthur Helps. London: Smith, Elder, and Co. 1868.

The Queen of England—to give this distinguished Lady her proudest title—has already invited her people into her confidence, and thrown herself upon their honest sympathy. She now admits them to a further intimacy, and anticipates, not unwisely in these rapid-moving times, the favourable verdict of posterity. All that we and others have said in praise of her estimable character, as partially revealed in the “Early Years of the Prince Consort,” receives confirmation from this private “Journal.” Making every allowance for idle

curiosity, we venture to think that the finer characteristics of these royal revelations, must have met with corresponding moral properties in the people who so largely appreciate them. The art of photography has already brought faithful portraits of this widowed Queen to every "album" in her kingdom ; and a no less truthful conception of her personal and domestic qualities as now present in the heads and hearts of her subjects. These subjects, although nothing doubting of their human kinship with royalty, are very naturally gratified by the now tangible verity that there are also hearts and homes in the palace, equal to the best and purest of their familiar hearths. Whilst others, not her subjects, who are apt to believe that royalty is as effete as chivalry or feudalism, incontinently admit that in the person of Queen Victoria it has yielded a flower of rare beauty in these latter days. These modest "Leaves from the Journal," it is true, are not at all conventionally noble, that is in outward aspect, so far as pomp and circumstance and courtly bravery go to make up the *ensemble* of regal nobility. They, with their Queenly author, are noble, as all persons and things that are both good and great in themselves contain that dignity in the grand simplicity of truth. Neither, indeed, could a greater mistake be committed than to criticise this book at all, seeing that it has no literary pretensions whatever, although it might teach many writers a lesson in plain and unaffected force of style ; sincerity and artlessness constitute the charm of its manner. The book is simply to be accepted as a remarkably pleasant fact, full of the best of meanings.

Understanding that the daily press has so largely reproduced this work, and that a popular edition is about to be issued at a nominal price, we need not sample it here ; nor can we sum its contents with more accurate brevity than they are done in the title. Mr Helps has further so intimately apprehended the spirit of this ingenuous diary, as might have been expected from the refined and thoughtful author of "Friends in Council," that there is nothing left for us to do but to borrow from his prefatory remarks. These, moreover, acquire additional value from the circumstance of the editor's convenient official position, as Clerk in Ordinary to Her Majesty's Privy Council.

After stating that the volume now published is merely "such a record of the impressions received by the Royal author in the course of her journeys, as might serve hereafter to recall to her own mind the scenes and circumstances which had been the source of so much pleasure," he proceeds to observe, that it would not be becoming on his part to dwell largely upon its merits. "He may, however," he adds, "allude to the picturesque descriptions of scenery in which the work abounds ; to the simplicity of diction throughout it ; and to the perfect faithfulness of narration which is one of its chief characteristics ; for in every page the writer describes what she thinks and feels, rather than what she might be expected to think and feel." Respecting the notes to the volume, which bear traces of recent writing, he remarks that "besides indicating that peculiar memory for persons, and that recognition of personal attachment, which have been very noticeable in our Sovereigns, they illustrate, in a striking manner the patriarchal feeling (if one may apply such a word as "patriarchal" to

a lady) which is so strong in the present occupant of the throne. Perhaps there is no person in these realms who takes a more deep and abiding interest in the welfare of the household committed to his charge, than our gracious Queen does in hers, or who feels more keenly what are the reciprocal duties of masters and servants. Nor does any one wish more ardently than her Majesty that there should be no abrupt severance of class from class, but rather a gradual blending together of all classes—caused by a full community of interests, a constant interchange of good offices, and a kindly respect felt and expressed by each class to all its brethren in the great brotherhood that forms a nation.” Then towards the conclusion of his Preface, the editor refers to a feature in this gentle chronicle, upon which, however, with the reticence of good taste, he does not bestow the detailed encomium, which doubtless he felt tempted to do;—the aspect of the Court in these our times, as here incidentally disclosed. But we who are free to remark upon it, may not repress the opinion that, in the blameless lives of Queen Victoria and Prince Albert, the moral standard of royalty has been pitched so high, that the worthy British subject is not at all likely to accept, with becoming patience, any degradation of it in the future. Without flattery to either, we make bold to say, that the splendid example of the throne is as much the reflection of contemporary English life, as it in turn may be held to reflect the virtuous qualities of the present Court. We have not read history aright, if we erroneously draw a silent inference in support of our view from the annals of Court life bygone in those realms.

One thing Mr Helps has not adverted to, by which we were much impressed in reading this “*Journal*.” We refer to the wise liberality of spirit, unconsciously exhibited by the royal writer towards the different Church organisations in her empire. This display of catholicity on the part of the nominal head of two sister Churches, has aroused the impotent wrath of some journals that we choose to designate as the inconsiderate advocates of exclusive Anglicanism. The idea of the head of the English Church attending a Presbyterian parish church in Scotland—with which church, as it happens, the British Queen, in her state capacity, stands closely related—but more than all, the very idea of this amiable lady, so far forgetting her constitutional relation to the Church of England, as to suffer herself to be sensibly affected by the extempore utterance of a Scotch minister, is held to be a grave ecclesiastical offence. That the Presbyterian preacher is also a Chaplain to the Queen, is evidently of no account with the champions of Anglican conformity. In the presence of the imminent question of Church and State connection, which must be promptly settled, and probably not without violence, in the British isles, how inconceivably blind is such a paltry ebullition of temper. If it be uncharitable, however natural, to characterise this ignoble sentiment as both jealous and arrogant, we may at least inquire how far those who cherish it are prepared for the inevitable struggle. Certainly they are not endowed with the mere wisdom of the serpent, and as for the correlative quality typified in the dove, we need say nothing. Passing from them to the innocent subject of their censure, we would suggest that the Royal offender against the sole

divine order of English Episcopacy, may be excusable on the score of that necessity under which the ruling families of Europe renounce or adopt, matrimonially or otherwise, the variously prevalent nomenclatures of Christian dogma, and theories as to the doing of things ecclesiastical "in decency and in order." The very accident of such a situation, may have contributed not a little in this case towards the nourishing assimilation of all the purely spiritual elements in the Christian faith.

Having said thus much, it may not be amiss to indicate the passages in the "Journal," that have raised this ugly sectarian spirit. They are only three, as far so we can make out, and so short, that we shall give them *in extenso*:—

"October 29, 1854.—We went to the kirk, as usual, at twelve o'clock. The service was performed by the Rev. Norman M'Leod, of *Glasgow*, son of Dr M'Leod, and anything finer I never heard. The sermon, entirely extempore, was quite admirable; so simple and yet so eloquent, and so beautifully argued and put. The text was from the account of the coming of Nicodemus to Christ by night, St John, chapter 3. Mr M'Leod showed in the sermon how we *all* tried to please *self*, and live for *that*, and in so doing found no rest. Christ had come not only to die for us, but to show us how we were to live. The second prayer was very touching; his allusions to us were so simple, saying, after his mention of us, 'bless their children.' It gave me a lump in my throat, as also when he prayed for 'the dying, the wounded, the widow, and the orphans.' [The Crimean war was then in progress.] Every one came back delighted; and how satisfactory it is to come back from church with such feelings! The servants and the Highlanders—all—were equally delighted."

"October 14. 1855.—To kirk at twelve o'clock. The Rev. J. Caird, one of the most celebrated preachers in *Scotland*, performed the service, and electrified all present by a most admirable and beautiful sermon, which lasted nearly an hour, but which kept one's attention rivetted. The text was from the twelfth chapter of Romans and the eleventh verse. '*Not slothful in business; fervent in spirit; serving the Lord.*' He explained in the most beautiful and simple manner what real religion is; how it ought to pervade every action of our lives; not a thing only for Sundays, or for our closet; not a thing to drive us from the world; not 'a perpetual moping over good books,' but 'being and doing good;' letting everything be done in a Christian spirit. It was as fine as Mr M'Leod's sermon last year, and sent us home much edified."

The third count in the indictment is from the Irish tour of 1849, and the entry on which it is based is dated from Dublin:—

"Tuesday, August 7.—From here [the Bank] we drove to the *Model School*, where we were received by the Archbishop of Dublin [Whately] and the Roman Catholic Archbishop Murray (a fine venerable-looking old man of eighty), and the other gentlemen connected with the school. We saw the *Infant*, the *Girl's*, and the *Boy's schools*. Children of all creeds are admitted, and their different doctrines are taught separately, if the parents wish it; but the *only* teaching enforced is that of the gospel truths, and love, and charity.

This is truly Christian, and ought to be the case everywhere. From here we visited *Trinity College*, the Irish University, which is not conducted upon so liberal a system."

We may remark, in closing our brief notice of this "Journal," that, in addition to such matters as already touched upon, it contains graphic memoranda of excursions made in company with the late Prince, and of the healthy delight which they brought; expressions of grateful acknowledgment for the friendly civilities of those with whom the tourists were associated; bursts of generous emotion inspired by the beauties of external nature, and by the peace of a happy domestic life; sentiments of loving solicitude for the welfare of her immediate dependents, as well as of her subjects, and of patriotic sympathy in such national events as the death of the Duke of Wellington and the downfall of Sebastopol. There are also several very effective sketches by the royal hand, which are above mere amateur art. One in particular, of a dead stag "killed by Albert," "scratched on a bit of paper that Macdonald had in his pocket, which I put on a stone, while Albert and Vicky, with the others, built a little cairn to mark the spot." And there are, furthermore, certain literary allusions indicative of no ordinary sensibility and culture. The beautiful quotation from Clough's "Bothie of Tober-na-Vuolich," made when "gazing and gazing on God's glorious works," it would be impertinent to call merely *apropos*, whilst the elevating lines from the "Lay of the Last Minstrel" are so touchingly apposite, as coming from the royal widow, that we must even rehearse them anew:—

"Land of brown heath and shaggy wood,
Land of the mountain and the flood,
Land of my sires! what mortal hand
Can e'er untie the filial band
That knits me to thy rugged strand?
Still as I view each well-known scene,
Think what is now, and what hath been,
Seems as, to me, of all bereft,
Sole friends thy woods and streams are left;
And thus I love thee better still,
Even in extremity of ill."

LAICUS.

Spiritual Wives. By W. HEPWORTH DIXON. 2 Vols. Hurst and Blackett, London. 1868.

This is exactly such a performance as we should have looked for from the author of "New America," and personal remark being invited by a "portrait of the author,"—as if the obtrusive egotism of the book were not enough,—we are free to observe a finely-suggested fitness between this literary mess and its composer. Last July we noticed the author's distasteful *fricassee* of American travel, garnished with smart vulgarity and self-conceit, at greater length than it deserved. We are in no danger of a similar indiscretion with these volumes, for we reckon our pages almost polluted by a reference to them. Indeed, we should not have adverted to this offensive publication, did we not see that a "third edition" was "now ready," and had not our indignation been aroused by the citation of certain "opinions of the press" in the publishers' advertisements. When

the unwary public observes the name of a respectable journal adduced in certification of the merit and value of a book, it naturally attaches some weight to the judgment so avouched. That qualifying passages are excised, or adverse criticism ignored, is no more suspected than the frequently questionable origin of the puff. Thus were we, in comparative innocence, led to believe that this was "the most remarkable book of the season,—a book which all thoughtful men would read with absorbed interest, and which would scarcely startle more readers than it would charm"—(*Leader*). We were also informed, upon no slight authorities, "that Mr Dixon had treated his subject in a philosophical spirit, and in his usual graphic manner"—(*Examiner*); that "the style of the work was charming, the author's best,"—(*Globe*)—[this we do not dispute]—"a lithe and sinewy style, and a picturesque knowledge of the most attractive literary forms, enabling Mr Dixon to make his subject at once interesting and attractive"—(*London Review*). "The tone of the composition," we read again, "is refined and pure to a degree,—not a coarse line or a coarse thought throughout the two volumes." A bolder critic made us ashamed of our ignorance of the fact (?) that "public curiosity was thoroughly awakened on the subject of spiritual wives," although, with amiable consideration, he acquainted us that "these two handsome volumes, written in the most vivid, animated, and pictorial of styles, would tell us all that we needed to know about them"—(*Morning Star*). It was further added, "almost superfluously," that "the moral of the book, from first to last, was just what one might have expected from a cultivated and high-principled English author."

How heartily we wish that some honourable journal, impatient of book-making and book-selling tricks, would expose the system—for such we believe it to be—of the literary *claque*. In these days, it has unfortunately befallen, that authorship has become a trade, and it would appear that it is no more exempt than other commerce or industry either from the "shop-keeping canker," or from the evils of "unionism." Commending this question to such capable moralists as, we are glad to think, the British press can boast, we shall neither stay to criticise the critics we have quoted, nor, having regard to the finer sensibilities of our readers, shall we be inordinately careful to justify ourselves in affirming a different and entirely adverse judgment respecting the subject of these encomiums.* In extenuation, however, of what we hold to be the offence of these "book-tasters," we shall give them the benefit of the doubt that, likely enough, their glib vocabulary may have been brought into play through the mere mechanism of habit.

We simply decline to misappropriate our space by attempting anything like a summary of this ill-conceived and worse-executed production; and we even prefer to leave our condemnatory verdict open to challenge, rather than to excerpt passages in its support that are unfit for perusal. It may shortly be said, that the work is designed to be

* The editor of the *British and Foreign Evangelical Review* is glad to learn that four of the most influential organs of English opinion—namely, the *Times*, *Daily News*, *Pall Mall Gazette*, and *Spectator*—have also given the work under notice their most unqualified condemnation.

popular,—“affording more entertainment,” says one admiring critic, “than can be extracted from a score of romances”—(*Morning Post*),—and that the subjects dealt with cannot possibly become popular save in a bad sense. Their vulgar *ad captandum* exhibition would seem to shew that the author was aware of that fact. With a trim and smug complacency, he speaks of “dark iniquities” as religious phenomena; and he accepts in good faith the hypocritical disguises of their perpetrators. He has tricked out the leprosy of sin in a dress of tawdry finery, and he has mingled the evil odours of disease and corruption with an equally sickening perfumery of his own. Doubtless, there are states of insanity psychical as well as moral, and both may develope into social evils; but the one class, like the other,—if, indeed, there are two classes,—must be approached practically and wisely, with a reluctance only conquered by a high sense of duty and personal capacity, and with an unequivocal desire to read their lessons and to find a remedy. The vices of great cities differ chiefly in this from the baptized profligacy of Mr Dixon’s clients, that while these assume a cloak of religion, the actors in the others are content to be no better than they are called. Subjects of nameless infamy, like those here popularised,—though their importance is vastly over-rated in a so-called spiritual aspect,—are only open to a hard scientific treatment, almost surgical in effect, at the hands of a competent social economist. To vary the phrase, it may be admitted, that a dry statistical report of such enormities may be necessary to intelligent legislative repression or police regulation. Here, in themselves, they are merely made the pander of the vilest pruriency; and where too obviously repulsive in the nakedness of their deformity, an alluring euphemism of style serves the turn. The meretricious and glavering treatment which they receive in the work before us, places it in the category of those vicious publications against which the Pure Literature Society—*quantum valeat*—was supposed to organise a crusade.

In thus briefly dismissing these “handsome volumes,” it may be as well, perhaps, to glance at the flimsy materials of which they are composed. These naturally fall under three divisions, although “this fascinating branch of the history of our Christian society” is served up in sixty-four abrupt and sensational chapters. The first of these divisions relates to a school of Pietism, at Königsberg, in East Prussia, which, in the last half century, became notorious, though not infamous, through a scandalous trial. Its chief interest in this “most remarkable book of the season,” is, of course, in connection with the scandal, and is derived from a grossly indecent and judicially worthless piece of evidence, that was prudently consigned to oblivion by the Supreme Court at Berlin. With an affectation of mystery, and on the frivolous pretext of “serving the interests of truth,” this document is ostentatiously paraded in the original German. The second division details the accomplished author’s visit to Prince’s Agapemone, in Somersetshire, and recounts the antecedents of its founder and his colleagues. The almost condoned blasphemy, the thinly veiled obscenity, and the utterly depraved sentiment of these chapters, may not, even in defence of our accusation, be suffered to blacken these pages. It may suffice to observe, that every dictate of moral prob-

priety, and all rules of literary taste, are here alike outraged by this "cultivated and high-principled English author." These remarks are equally applicable to the third division of Mr Dixon's melancholy compilation, which consists of scraps of correspondence from obscure cheats and fanatics,—with whom he fraternised in his ideal "New America,"—strung together on a thread of fustian philosophy. "The moral of the book from first to last," as designed to be read by his spiritual friends, is a virtual defence of the great doctrine of divorce, if not also of concubinage, "free love," and communism,—a few qualifying expressions to the contrary notwithstanding. And it concludes with an implicit apology for spiritual marriage,—that is, the right of a legally-married husband to seek his "celestial affinity" in his neighbour's wife, and *vice versa*,—the higher right of wedding souls for eternity absolving from all contracts confessedly made for time. Texts of Scripture are irreverently and inexpertly handled in this argument, but the explicit assurance that "in heaven they neither marry nor are given in marriage," is shrewdly evaded, seeing that the converse proposition would relegate the institution of "spiritual mating" to another and a profoundly lower sphere. LACIUS.

Verses on Various Occasions. Burns, Oates, & Co., London. 1868.

Dr John Henry Newman of Birmingham has just issued a new edition of his poems under the above title. His long familiar contributions to the "Lyra Apostolica," written above thirty years ago, and the "Dream of Gerontius," written from "The Oratory" in 1865, constitute the staple of this collection. The times and places of writing are here for the first time appended to the several pieces: a bit of labelling too often neglected, and very necessary in this instance to assist readers in connecting them with their producing phases, as recorded in the 'Apologia.' These chaste and chastened verses occupy, in fact, the relation of chorus to the life-drama of which Mr Charles Kingsley's impulsive challenge was, mediately or immediately, the procuring cause. We know few more sadly instructive autobiographies than those of the brothers Newman—the "Apologia" and the "Phases of Faith"—each of them typical of much contemporary life, and both recalling the somewhat parallel lives of George Herbert and Lord Herbert of Cherbury. That of the milder Newman finds its complement and elucidation in the effort of his gentle Muse. It will not surprise the intelligent reader if we remark the striking resemblance to an "evangelical" tone, which much of this sacred poesy presents, such a likeness having been formerly observed in some of the "plain sermons." We may not here inquire into the cause, but curiously enough, it may be so far doctrinal; for, among many conflicting tenets, there is yet some canonical agreement between Protestant and Catholic; and the individual soul may not, from all doctrines, gather equal strength. Notably with an early bias from the Protestant side, a preference may be evinced for the grander and simpler among them. We merely refer to the effect; and in this reference we clearly own, that those compositions before us, which have generally the least commended themselves to our approbation,

are those in which the similarity we have remarked is least apparent. Many of them that almost reach a spiritual beauty, are marred by the intrusion of superstitious dogma; but others again, we must admit, owe an exquisite charm of phantasy to the sublimation of those very materials we hold to be doctrinally obnoxious. None of them entitle their author to the jealously restricted rank of poet, whilst, as verses, they are almost organically perfect. It is as vividly discovering the man himself, maturing in mellow repose and settled serenity from a long spiritual conflict, that we mainly estimate their worth. There is no dramatic flaunting of the outward ritualistic apparatus, to distract from the inner subjective character of this poetry of the soul. It is pervaded by a subdued undertone of piety and trustful resignation; and although this placid confidence may rest on other bases than we approve, one cannot restrain sympathy with the mingled sweetness and fervour, which here find so delicate expression. It is in the mood, and in the mood alone, that we feel free to be at one with him. The references to the Virgin Mary, notwithstanding their beauty, are offensive to our ears, but we construe them with the author of "*Religio Medici*"—whilst others are directing their devotions to the handmaiden, offering ours to God, and rectifying the error of their prayers by rightly ordering our own. One or more perhaps of the earlier pieces—"Snap-dragon," for example—may seem slightly Emersonian in conceit and structure, but the disciplined verse of Dr Newman, we need hardly say, is entirely free from any taint of that brusque intellectual Puritanism. Rather, we should say, it owes its peculiar charm to the religious restraint he has imposed upon himself, whereby he has, after a fashion, weaned his spirit from the world, yielded it into a grateful captivity, and "rhythmically drilled" himself into the calmness of quiet expectation. With David—whose "doom of greatness" he tenderly contemplates—his heart is fixed, and he sings and gives praise. For like all the best devotional poetry there is here something more or less of the sublime spirit of the Hebrew Psalter. Let us not, however, urge an individual opinion in this place, when a few selections, such as we have room for, are more likely to convey a just impression. Those who are already familiar with these "pious breathings of a devout soul," will certainly not grudge the repetition, were it only for the sake of others to whom they may not be less acceptable.

This, which was entitled "*Faith*" in the "*Lyra Apostolica*," and had these words prefixed—*Unto the godly there ariseth up light in the darkness*—is in the present edition called "*The Pillar of the Cloud*":—

"Lead, kindly light, amid the encircling gloom,
 Lead Thou me on!
 The night is dark, and I am far from home—
 Lead Thou me on!
 Keep Thou my feet, I do not ask to see
 The distant scene,—one step enough for me.

"I was not ever thus, nor prayed that Thou
 Shouldst lead me on.
 I loved to choose and see my path; but now
 Lead Thou me on!

I loved the garish day, and spite of fears,
Pride ruled my will: remember not past years.

"So long Thy power hath blest me, sure it still
Will lead me on,
O'er moor and fen, o'er crag and torrent, till
The night is gone;
And with the morn those angel faces smile
Which I have loved long since, and lost awhile.

" *At sea.*

June 16, 1833."

We shall not spoil these beautiful lines by idle comment of ours. In the two pieces immediately subjoined, however, we may remark the unity of strain, although there is an interval of thirty years between the writing:—

"Moses, the patriot fierce, became
The meekest man on earth,
To show us how love's quickening flame
Can give our souls new birth.

"Moses, the man of meekest heart,
Lost Canaan by self-will,
To show where grace has done its part
How sin defiles us still.

"Thou who has taught me in Thy fear,
Yet seest me frail at best,
O grant me loss with Moses here,
To gain his future rest.

" *At sea.*

December 19, 1832."

"Unveil, O Lord, and on us shine
In glory and in grace;
This gawdy world grows pale before
The beauty of Thy face.

"Till Thou art seen it seems to be
A sort of fairy ground,
Where suns unsetting light the sky
And flowers and fruits abound.

"But when Thy keener, purer beam
Is poured upon our sight,
It loses all its power to charm,
And what was day is night.

" *The Oratory.*

"Its noblest toils are then the scourge
Which made Thy blood to flow;
Its joys are but the treacherous thorns
Which circled round thy brow.

"And thus when we renounce for Thee
Its restless aims and fears,
The tender memories of the past,
The hopes of coming years.

"Poor is our sacrifice, whose eyes
Are lighted from above;
We offer what we cannot keep,
What we have ceased to love.

1862."

The touch of irony which some have felt in these concluding couplets is almost too delicate for the name, and we suspect the writer himself to have been innocent of it. We at least are more sensible of the predominating argument as between "The Two Worlds," in the approved vanity of the things of time, which issues in their renunciation, and in the utter abandonment of the creature of change and decay, to the will of the Unchangeable, "in the buoyant ocean of His love." The direct personal bearing of these devout expressions, however, we fancy, does not less partake of what has been termed "the excessive individuality of Protestantism," than of the undue self-absorption of a Catholic recluse. So far forth, indeed, as this characteristic is not extrinsically qualified, it indicates something of the puritan in the priest of "The Oratory." An objective conformity seems to hold but a subsidiary place in his thoughts, and

thus the compact organisation of the Church of Rome may be to him but a covert and a defence—affording him a sense of material security and tranquillity—in his coveted seclusion. We may not dwell, however, on this debateable ground. We prefer to show, in the following stanzas addressed to England, how this subjective temper expands itself in patriotic solicitude; and though it be in language of sorrow and of warning, yet it is noticeable that the Muse of this almost reluctant neophyte, nowhere either in admonition or in eulogy, now addresses Rome. What a fervent love of country underlies the burden of this scroll—

“ Tyre of the west, and glorying in the name
More than in faith's pure fame!
O trust not crafty fort nor rock renowned
Earned upon hostile ground;
Wielding Trade's master-keys at thy proud will
To lock or loose its waters, England! trust not still.

“ Dread thine own power! Since haughty Babel's prime,
High towers have been man's crime
Since her hoar age, when the huge moat lay bare,
Strongholds have been man's snare.
Thy nest is in the crags; ah! refuge frail!
Mad counsel in its hour, or traitors will prevail.

“ He who scanned Sodom for his righteous men
Still spares thee for thy ten;
But should vain tongues the Bride of Heaven defy,
He will not pass thee by;
For, as earth's kings welcome their spotless guest,
So gives He them by turn, to suffer or be blest.

“ *At sea.*

December 18, 1832.”

From a desire not to mar their effect, we purposely withheld a suggestion which these lines conveyed, until we had suffered the reader to peruse them. Ah! Dr Newman! “Strongholds have been man's snare,” most truly; and in all Christian courtesy we would inquire if such a saying does not strangely consist with a flight unto the vaunted stronghold of the seven hills. Bating the vulgarity of the insinuation, might we not substitute *Babylon* for “Tyre,” and speak of other “Keys” than those of “Trade?” Some of his hardest sayings of “cruel-natured Rome” are here suppressed by her now zealous votary; but although “the step-dame's art” is no longer imputed to her, her praise as the true mother is not sung, neither does her whilom wayward child celebrate his reconciliation in numbers harmonious or other. We have noticed upwards of twenty of *Delta's* contributions to the “Apostolica,” which are not here reproduced, and some of the others are altered without real amendment. On the other hand, however, the present edition contains nearly forty newly-collected pieces, besides translations from the Roman breviary. The “Dream of Gerontius” is the most sustained effort of his genius, and it is also the latest, but we can hardly treat of its merits in this place, without likewise assailing its dogmatic basis, and our limits forbid. Suffice it to say that the subject is the passage of a soul to purgatory, a subject which we hold of doubtful legitimacy in modern literature, and that there are some strange and exquisite beauties in the poem—*quâ Poema*—which are almost dazzling in their fervid brightness.

LAIUS.

David Gray, and other Essays, chiefly on Poetry. By ROBERT BUCHANAN. Sampson Low, Son, and Marston, London. 1868.

The only essay of Mr Buchanan's which we had read previously to the appearance of this collection, was that on "Literary Morality," and now that we have read the others, we are disposed to think it the best. That is in point of style only we mean, for so far as we understand the doctrine of that paper, we do not agree with it. The doctrine seems to be, that if an author is sincere in what he writes, there can be no immoral tendency in his work. In other words, that only when an author is sincere can he transform his materials—whether moral or immoral in themselves—into a work of art; and if he is not sincere, he does not reach art,—his work is not literature, and the question of immorality need not be discussed at all. Now, it will be admitted, that that which is recognised as standard literature contains much that is not artistic in this sense, although highly artistic in the usual acceptation of the term, as well as much that is written, so far as any man can judge, in perfect sincerity, which is destitute of morality. No one will deny the quality of art to Goethe's "Werther," for example, whether sincerely conceived or no, and we all know the pernicious effects which that *nouvelette* produced in thin sentimental circles. Mr Buchanan himself acknowledges that some artistically treated immoralities, harmless to cultivated readers, may be hurtful to the ignorant. "If poor Boccaccio," he cries, "could only hear what Smith and Brown say about him!" For our part, we do not think that mere intellectual knowledge or ignorance makes any difference. There are depraved moral appetites in excess of purer tastes, and while the light of the latter may be some protection from evil, the former will be found to love a congenial darkness. "Spiritualisation," we are told, "is fatal to the very perceptibility" of bestialities, lies, and insincerities; but we do not believe it, although the author of "Spiritual Wives" may endorse it. And if "George Sand has conferred literary splendour on illicit passion," she has merely prostituted her accomplishments. It is a trite quotation, "that to the pure all things are pure," but this implies a subjective purity, and has nothing to do with the objective immorality of literature. Then as to sincerity, many eminently sincere men, in ordinary sense, have written books, free from any grossness, but with a bad tendency, just as many good men, being in error themselves, will serve the interests of error, while many eminently insincere men may possess great artistic skill. For one thing, however, it may be said that the world does not choose bad men as the acknowledged representatives of its own character, as it likes to flatter itself on its perfections; and thus it falls out that, with rampant evil in all ages, it is the good that chiefly survives. But how much floating evil is there not in every age, and lingering evil from the past, which, in the disguise of art, permeates society, and saps its morality? For it is with society we have to deal in such matters, and not with self-confident "poets or seers" exclusively. There is nothing for it but to fall back upon the old-fashioned notion that genius or talent, like any other gift or property, may be used or may be abused, and art accordingly made the vehicle of good or evil. Conscience

must be the referee. Hence we do not follow this quasi-philosophical argument to its implied conclusion, that there can be no such thing as immorality in literature. As well might we be asked to believe that it possessed no morality—a notion which the positivists will perhaps come to entertain when they have consistently reasoned out their philosophy.

We have said that this essay is the best in point of style, for, setting aside some extravagancies, it is temperately written on the whole; but of the other papers composing this volume, we regret that we have hardly a good word to say. Their style is as bad and offensive as the carping and querulous temper, the unabashed ignorance, and the insufferable conceit which they display. Many of Mr Buchanan's poems which had given us genuine pleasure, are henceforth more or less obscured by the revelation here made of the gloomy and grudging character of the poet, for we cannot shake off the association now conveyed. It is really to be lamented that he ever took to "crabbed prose." We might possibly have exempted the memoir of "David Gray" from this general censure; but reading it, as we did, after the other pieces in the volume, we felt an echo throughout it of the insolent vanity, recklessness, and immodesty which had oppressed us in them. To use the elegant phrase he applies to Mr John Stuart Mill, "dogmatism and puppyism supervene." As for poor David Gray himself,—not to speak of his verses, of which we have no knowledge,—he is represented by his friend as the ill-starred victim of literary ambition, but the lesson of his abrupt life is apparently overlooked. Its pathetic issue almost suspends criticism in claiming our pity, as the sense of pain translates the ridiculous into the tragic. His biographer's pretentious attitude, however, provokes merely a sentiment of the ludicrous, in so far as that is compatible with disgust; and long may we be spared a sublimer feeling at any painful cost to him. At the same time, it would be mistaken charity to excuse the crudities of the bombastic stuff here offered to public acceptance; and if Mr Buchanan ever comes to a better mind, as we trust he may, he would be the first to despise us for that service. And talking of charity, our impulsive essayist, it may be said, talks very largely of charity,—almost assuming it to be the sole absolute perfection, instead of the highest relative grace,—but more uncharitable judgments it has rarely been our lot to read than are within the compass of this little book. Probably, one who condescends to patronise Christianity in the fashion he does, may not apprehend its spirit so truly as if he had modestly submitted himself thereto. Putting charity aside, however, what are we to think of the following discriminating judgments which are about as accurate in fact as they are exquisite in taste? Some of these rash words are occasionally qualified by the context, but they represent very fairly the "tenour of his way." Milton had "no spiritual glamour, felt no real emotion," and, consequently, "his bald and turgid prose is pieced out clumsily into ten-syllable lines, which limp like Vulcan;" Dryden wrote "bombastic tragedies," and was "a grand specimen of literary immorality,"—a quality which we thought had been argued out of existence; "Crabbe's pictures are nearly worthless;" Blake was "a morbid dreamer;" Southey is "an example of

defective vision ;” Scott was “no poet ; he *saw*, but he was not *moved* enough to *sing* ;” Goethe was “great in literature by virtue of his spiritual littleness ;” Hood is a “wonderful, but totally misunderstood genius ;” De Quincey, “a loose, but occasionally felicitous writer ;” Thackeray “works in his own sickening and peculiar fashion,”—and yet his contemptuous critic borrows his deliverance upon Dean Swift very literally ; Carlyle’s “message is a *LIE*, and himself a humbug and a ranter ;” Mr J. S. Mill has “sunk his philosophy in bigotry and folly,” and it is henceforth associated with “the blatant periods of Mr Bright, and the polished pettiness of Mr Lowe ;” “Mr Arnold has by no means *lived* enough to determine living questions ;” Mr Tennyson has given us “a garden-philosopher’s group of modern idylls,” and has made some “exquisite attempts to paint English landscape ;” “with the exception of a few faint utterances of Wordsworth, all our other religious poetry is conventional and inartistic,”—*et sic de similibus*. What are we to think of the superior attainments, not to speak of such an insignificant matter as the competence, of one who can deliver himself in such a style ? We are asked to regard this volume as his “Confession of Faith,” and it shall answer the question. He is a *sacer vates*, a poet or seer, a calm student, “close to the stars,” and with “no scorn for his fellows.” His gospel, he tells us, is “charity to men and women, and most of all to himself.” His “vocation is the study of eternal, not contemporary, truth.” In order to perfect that vocation, we are not surprised to learn that he finds it “imperatively necessary to live alone.”

As an offset to this destructive *rôle*, Mr Buchanan has constructed a “cosmical man” out of the unpromising materials furnished by Walt Whitman, a loafer and a rowdy, with a dash of eccentricity, impiety, and indecency, who was lately known at Washington when Lincoln was President. He is here described as “a large, dispassionate, daring, and splendidly-proportioned animal, remaining unmoved, explanatory up to a certain point, but sphinx-like when questioned too closely on morality and religion.” We are told, “on the best authority,” that this important personage—“whose tall figure might be encountered daily at the street-corners and drinking-bars of the capital”—is exercising on the youth of America an influence similar to that exercised by Socrates over the youth of Greece. He has written “about ten thousand lines of unrhymed verse, very Biblical in form, and sometimes even rhythmical like the prose of Plato.” How far Biblical or Platonic, let our readers determine from the following lines, which, but for the need of shewing up this folly, we should apologise for inserting :—

“Who goes there ? hankering, gross, mystical, nude ;
 How is it I extract strength from the beef I eat ?
 What is a man, anyhow ? What am I ? What are you ?—
 I wear my hat as I please, indoors and out.
 Why should I pray ? Why should I venerate and be ceremonious ?
 Having pried through the strata, analysed to a hair, counsel’d with doctors,
 and calculated close,
 I find no sweeter fat than sticks to my own bones.—
 I exist as I am,—that is enough ;
 If no other in the world be aware, I sit content ;
 And if each and all be aware, I sit content.

One world is aware, and by far the largest to me, and that is myself ;—
 I am an acme of things accomplish'd, and I am an encloser of things to be.—
 All forces have been steadily employ'd to complete and delight me ;
 Now on this spot I stand with my robust soul."

This rhodomontade would read much more effectively backwards. We don't mind throwing out a straw for Mr Buchanan, if he will catch it, in the way of a suggestion that, on reconsideration, he may find he has only admired the dramatic "brutality" of this modern Caliban. He won't thank us, however, for he evidently believes that "Walt Whitman has arisen in the States to sow the seeds of indigenous literature, by putting in music the spiritual and fleshly yearnings of the cosmical man." Is he not also a *sacer vates*? "He respects no particular creed, admits no specific morality prescribed by the civil law, but affirms in round terms the universal equality of man. He pictures the pageant of life in the country and in cities; all is a fine panorama wherein mountains and valleys, nations and religions, *genre* pictures and gleams of sunlight, babes on the breast and dead men in shrouds, pyramids and brothels, deserts and populated streets, sweep wonderfully by him. To all these things," it is said, "he is bound; wherever they force him he is not wholly a free agent, but on one point he is very clear,—that so far as he is concerned he is the most important thing of all." So he proceeds "to particularise the privileges of the flesh, and asserts that in his own personal living body there is no uncleanness. He sees the beasts are not ashamed, why, therefore," it is asked, "should he be ashamed? 'Sounding his barbaric yawp over the roofs of the world,' as he himself phrases it, he is the clear forerunner of the great American poets, long yearned for, now prophesied, but not perhaps beheld." Perhaps not thus. Poor Artemus Ward could only get the length of making "the world revolve on its own axis, subject to the constitution of the United States." Walt Whitman "strikes with his feet the apex of the apices, and whipper-snappers titter with delight."

We have now some idea of what Mr Buchanan depreciates, and we have seen the sort of thing he most admires. We have also seen how he can express himself. It were needless to add to the irony of the situation, if, indeed, it were possible, save by quoting him further, which is not our purpose. We shall, therefore, leave untouched his criticism "on his own Tentatives," only remarking that it nearly succeeds in dispelling any lingering fancy one might have had for his verse. In his present posture, it were idle to wish Mr Buchanan any of that "culture" he so much despises, or that "sweetness and light," against the refining influence of which he has set his face. We shall dismiss him with the elegant valediction of the Archbishop of Grenada, wishing him "all manner of prosperity, with a *little* more taste."

LAICUS.

VIII.—FRENCH LITERATURE.

Le Christianisme Moderne. Etude sur Lessing. Par Ernest Fontanès. Paris: Germer Baillière. 1867.

Etudes Evangéliques. Par Edmond de Pressensé. Paris: Ch. Meyrueis. 1867.

M. Fontanès' book is an important one, as indicating one of the features of the religious physiognomy of France at the present moment. The author is one of the pastors of Havre, belonging to the Reformed Church connected with the state. His style is clear, correct, even elegant. He does not shrink from any of the conclusions to which his theory leads him; his convictions are firm, amounting sometimes to disdain. "Curavi cæcos et leprosos sanavi; sed stultis medendis impar fui;" such is his motto. Even the firm from which the book issues (G. Baillière, beyond the limits usually attained by Protestant editors), is likely to secure to it a wide circulation.*

Here, then, is an author speaking the language of a convinced rationalist, who undertakes to explain to us what is called *liberal Protestantism*—*Ab uno disce omnes*.

We may as well begin by informing our readers that this study on Gottlob Ephraim Lessing is merely a canvas in the author's hands to embroider on it the portrait of Ernest Fontanès, but of Ernest Fontanès Germanised, or rather Lessingised.

Certainly, had the author lived under the first empire, he would have drawn down upon himself the severe criticism that the Duke of Rovigo, minister of police, addressed to Madame de Stäel, on account of her enthusiasm for the Germans, in her book upon Germany:—

"It seems to me that the air of this country does not agree with you; we are not reduced to seek our models among the peoples whom you admire. . . . Your last work is not French. It is not possible to let it pass."

And the 10,000 copies of the work upon Germany already printed, were transformed into card-board, perfectly white, valued at twenty louis d'or, the only indemnity which the publisher was able to obtain!

Happily for the pastor of Havre the *great criticism* of Germany has acquired the right of citizenship in France, thanks to the labours of the *Revue Germanique*, the *Revue Théologique Protestante* (Strasbourg), and the numerous translations from the German.

The author will doubtless protest against our inculpation. He

* We draw attention to this point, *i.e.*, the patronage of a well-known house in Paris, which is not Protestant. To take one's place (were it only in a catalogue) beside Messrs H. Taine, Paul Janet, Ad. Frank, Emile Saisset, Charles de Rémusat, Littré, is not so easy in France, unless for an author of the rationalistic school who has written upon the *Origin and the Transformation of Christianity* in the manner of the Pastor A. Coquerel, or an author whose talent allows his evangelical principles to pass, like Prof. R. St Hilaire, or Dr E. de Pressensé.

will say that he has remained French, and that he has written for the French. He has believed, and therefore he has written. He wishes also, he adds, to take advantage of the awakening to religious studies in his native country, to free it from the yoke of biblical authority, from which it is piteously begging ready-made solutions of the questions pertaining to the soul. Not only so, but he is anxious to initiate it into a new era of liberty, and is asking himself whether the movement of opinion presages "this new era?" whether it will be fruitful enough to produce "a new state" of Christianity?—We are satisfied as to the theological convictions of M. Ernest Fontanès, but, after twice reading his book, we repeat, that we are at a loss to say who is the hero of it, Lessing or Fontanès?

But let us go on.

We need not enter into any biographical details concerning Lessing; they are to be found in M. Crouslé's book, *Lessing et le goût Français en Allemagne* (Paris, chez Durand, 1863.) We merely wish to point out what are the regenerating elements in the German author which the Frenchman would fain implant into his own country:—

1st, Lessing's toleration in religious matters. Madame de Stäel says of "Nathan the wise," "It is the finest among Lessing's works. It would be impossible to exhibit religious toleration in action in a manner more natural and more dignified than is done in this piece?"* Well, but our dramatist did not the less write, in regard to Pastor Alberti, who refused to read the curses against the pagans in the liturgy: "If we ought to love our neighbour as ourselves, we ought also to *call down the wrath of God upon those who deserve it.*" And what are we to think of a toleration which does not shrink from committing acts of insincerity and fraud? Our readers will understand that we allude to the *manner* in which Lessing gave to the world the famous "Fragments of Wolfenbüttel." It was under the cover of the freedom from censure, granted to the publication of manuscripts proceeding from the library of Wolfenbüttel, that Lessing, as administrator of the library, published, in 1774, the first part of the work of Samuel Reimarus (The toleration of the Deists), and gave it the title of "Fragments taken from the Papers of an Anonymous Writer." It seems to us that this was an abuse of a confidential post which Lessing had accepted with all its obligations. We are not therefore surprised to find that the prince regent reproached him for his imprudence, and ordered his minister to take away from him for a time his freedom from censure.†

The pastor of Havre does not take any notice of this want of candour on the part of his master. We may also add that he passes over

* *L'Allemagne.* Edition Charpentier, p. 211.

† Until 1827 Lessing passed for the author of the *Fragments*, but a professor at Hamburg, Gurlitz, proved that Reimarus had sent them to him. In 1839, Lessing's biographer, W. Körte, maintained that the *Education of Humanity* was no more his than the *Fragments*, and that it ought to be attributed to a debauchee, Dr Albert Thlaers, who was in the habit of communicating to Lessing the doubts he encountered in reading the fathers. Thus the most celebrated of Lessing's rationalistic writings would seem only to be borrowed. — *V. Le Christianisme Historique*, by the Abbé Chassay, tome i., p. 107.

in silence the insinuations of Lessing, to the effect that one's religious ideas are of no importance to the morality of one's life, and that without any aid from revelation, we can give to the world the spectacle of the most touching virtues. *

Lastly, is it fair,—when a man pretends to owe nothing to the light of revelation,—we say, is it fair for him to choose, as the principal and most enlightened personage of his drama, a Jew, that is, a man brought up in the school of the holy Scriptures? Had not Saladin himself caught an echo of Moses in the Koran? Strange inconsistency of rationalism! It cannot do without the revelation which it would fain repudiate, and it has not the courage to forego its external benefits, and go and live—or die, among the barbarians!

2d, Besides being the father of toleration, Lessing is, according to our author, the father of *modern criticism*. Modern criticism! This “peace-loving science, which threatens only what is false and bad; but which teaches man to find his fellow-man under ever-varying forms, and in contradictory literatures and theologies!”

Let us leave to M. Fontanès his illusions upon the “celestial virgin who unrolls with her fingers the golden thread which binds all ages of humanity together, and enables us to find everywhere the traces of God, and the road which leads to our destiny.” We know what to think of modern criticism: a veritable “dromedary traversing her ways.”

How many evident proofs does it not set aside with a single word! How many hypotheses, not only hollow, but degrading to human nature, does it not bear in triumphal procession to the sound of the cornet, flute, harp, sackbut, and psaltery, commanding all men to fall down and worship them! We cannot see anything worthy of praise in the acrimony, or bitterness, or proud disdainful irony of Lessing's criticism.

But M. Fontanès delights in this kind of criticism, because it demolishes the authority of the Scriptures, which, under the name of *Bibliolatry*, he would himself fain overthrow. There is a *Bibliolatry* which the Master censured before our author did, when he cried, “It is the spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing”; but the *Bibliolatry* that M. Fontanès attacks is the inspiration, the infallible authority of the Bible, this “Achilles' heel of Protestantism”; for he thus writes: “When we know to what a depth of *Bibliolatry* the Protestant can descend, we are not surprised at the poor savage who, seeing the missionary pass with a Bible under his arm, cried, “Look at that man's god; and what a god! He carries him in his pocket, while we have ours at the Marae.” † “The naïveté of the savage is a terrible condemnation of the views and practices of a certain orthodoxy: the object has changed, but the fetichism is the same.” (p. 95.)

The author also praises modern criticism because it attacks the miracles. The truth has nothing to do leaning on the miracles of the past. The miracles not being performed before me, and only reach-

* *Christ. Hist.*, Tome i., p. 160.

† The temple of the Polynesian divinities.

ing me through the medium of tradition, fall into the category of facts concerning which I may reach a very great probability, but never certainty. To be of any value, miracles would require to be *perpetual*; the Church of Rome understands this well. What a confusion, says modern criticism, between historical data and those of a revelation attested by Jesus Christ! His testimony, then, is just of equal weight with that of any other individual who is dead and buried; and the lies and impostures of Rome, condemned by the public tribunals, are as worthy of credence as the miracles contained in the gospel, and performed in the sight and hearing of multitudes, even of adversaries!

But we must continue.

Another merit of modern criticism is, that it holds with Lessing that Holy Writ is not the only source of our religious knowledge. "In the reaction against the despotism of the Church, and of tradition of which it is the organ, Protestantism allowed itself to overstate the importance of the Bible in the propagation of the gospel, and, for the masses of the faithful, it became an article of faith, that the Bible was the only source by which the knowledge of the gospel was kept up in the world. . . . The *occasional* character of the different writings of the New Testament hardly admits of that sovereign authority,—that identical and universal value, being attributed to them, which a degenerate and ignorant Protestantism is tempted to grant them Science permits of our affirming that the writers of the New Testament, persuaded, like all the early Christians, that the end of the world was at hand, did not think upon posterity while writing, and that their pre-occupations did not go beyond the circle of their contemporaries" (p. 115).

If this be the case, the apostles must have understood their vocation as "lights of the world, and the salt of the earth," very ill indeed, not to speak of their mission to "go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature," nor of the promise which the Master adds: "Lo, I am with you *always*, even unto the end of the world!"

The writers of the New Testament did not think of posterity! yet we see them spreading themselves through Samaria and Galilee, &c. If Paul thought only of his contemporaries, why did he establish churches everywhere, and wish to bring all men and all ages within the embraces of his charity? "I am debtor both to the Greeks and to the barbarians, both to the wise and to the unwise." If his view was bounded by contemporaneous events, how did he predict the restoration of the Jews, notwithstanding the destruction of Jerusalem and their final dispersion? "If the casting away of them be the reconciling of the world, what shall the receiving of them be, but life from the dead? blindness in part is happened unto Israel *until* the fulness of the Gentiles be come in." (Rom. xi. 15-25). Again, was the demonstration of the resurrection (1 Cor. xv.) the subjection of all things to the Son, and of the Son Himself to God,—was all that to be realised in apostolical times?

3d, The "Prince of critics," did more than inaugurate the era of such criticism; he discovered, or insinuated, that humanity would be

just as wise without the record of the life of Jesus Christ. Answering a question of his adversary, Pastor Goeze—"Without the writings of the New Testament would there be any traces of what Jesus Christ has done and taught?" Lessing exclaims: "God forbid that I should ever have so poor an opinion of the teaching of Christ as to answer *no* to that question! No, I would never pronounce that *no*, even though an angel from heaven had said it before me!"

M. Fontanès improves on these words: "In fact we may affirm that brotherly love and confidence in God our Father have entered so deeply into the consciences of the modern peoples, that the pages of the gospel might be dispersed to all the winds, without this ideal being effaced from the heaven of humanity; the history of the middle ages is extant to prove that the aim of the Christian religion does not depend upon the preservation of the biblical writings; the biblical writings have been neglected, forgotten, withdrawn from public circulation, without the eternal foundations of the Christian religion being reached" (p. 117).*

Abyssus abyssum invocat.—Fifteen years ago, Professor Colani had written, but with much precaution, in his review of Christian Theology and Philosophy (vol. vii., p. 242), "I put things at the worst; I suppose that, after impartial researches, the character of the Lord should appear stained by some moral defect, as is the case with Peter at Antioch, and of Paul at certain moments of his life,† truly it would be more painful for our souls than the decisive triumph of the ideas of Bruno Bauer, or of Strauss, which reduce the life of Jesus to nothing, or almost nothing: what ought we to do in such a case? Take up the evidence of the trial again and again, examine it over and over, in order not to be the dupes of a malevolent illusion. But, if the facts were patent, must we not believe them? Every Christian would experience in the highest degree the fearful void felt on the sudden loss of confidence in a bosom friend: humanity would seem fatherless, despoiled of its crown, and would find itself driven out of heaven: bitter mourning would fill the earth, but faith would remain, faith in the heavenly Father, life in God."

The Professor of Strasbourg perceived lamentation, mourning, and woe, were there only some spots on the Sun of Righteousness, but now Sun, Moon, and Stars of the biblical world may disappear, and be dispersed to all the winds, without the *ideal* being effaced from the heaven of humanity!‡

* After a declaration so absolute, we are rather at a loss to understand the following restriction: "But it is also established that the spirituality of the Christian principle was not preserved intact, and that tradition, when she was sole mistress, engendered all sorts of deviations, which approximated the pure religion of Christ to the pagan mythologies."—(p. 117.)

† A discovery which has since been made by F. Pécaut, in his "Christ and the Conscience." Others have followed in his track.

‡ It is curious to see how extremes meet! The liberal Protestant, Ernest Fontanès, quotes the ultramontane, Joseph de Maistre, in support of his theory: "Never was there, says the author of *Du Pape*, an idea more hollow than that of seeking (in the Holy Scriptures) the totality of Christian dogmas. There is not in these writings a single line which declares, or even hints at, the project of making them a code or a dogmatic declaration of all the articles of faith.'

Thus the Bible can no longer serve as a *rule*, either of life or of faith. Tradition goes before it: "as it appears from Tertullian that the apostolic fathers always appealed to tradition in the first place, and that the Scripture is not the *fundamentum demonstrationis*" (p. 118).

Therefore a good theologian will not have the slightest shadow of a scruple of conscience (from fear of deceiving himself), in drawing a distinction between the Scriptures and the word of God, between the Bible and religion; and the believer will no longer think all is lost, when such and such an *unauthenticated* document is taken from him, and such and such an *interpolation* erased. He will grant science full scope, as science will grant full scope to joy and faith. In this Lessing goes beyond Reimarus himself, according to whom Christianity falls or rises in proportion to the degree of credibility that the Bible possesses. "It is this precarious destiny," remarks M. Fontanès, that Lessing refused for Christianity, and all true believers (adds the pastor of Havre judiciously) ought to thank him for his labours, even though there should be some revisions to make in point of detail" (p. 122).

Do these conclusions scandalise us? But the "Scriptures propose to us doctrinal ideas which come from a culture, from a philosophy, to which we are strangers, and which do not spring from the bosom of Christianity" (p. 127). In short, "our society has grown up too much under the discipline of the sciences, to accept as positive formulas, and tried truths, all the charming expressions in which the Christian conscience clothed its internal experience, at that delicious moment when the soul sang to God its first love! It is too well initiated into the formation of epic poems, not to surprise the imagination at work, and to seek the idea under the splendour of the poetry; on the other hand, it has not leisure to sit down upon the benches of a council or a chapter, and follow all the ridiculous or odious revolutions of a theological battle. It tries to seize, in passing, some simple substantial truths; some solid and profound principles which may sustain it in the combat, and reveal to it pure horizons and noble hopes. It is seeking a religion capable of drawing it from earth without breaking the bonds which attach it to society—a religion which may make of each man the son of God and the brother of all men" (p. 136).

But enough of Lessing and his *alter ego*, E. Fontanès. We cannot understand how a pastor of the old martyr churches of France can find pleasure in exhuming a dead play-writer (a greater dialectician it is true, than play-writer, but nevertheless a play-writer), a pantheistic philosopher (according to the testimony of his friend Jacobi, and to the profound regret of his protector, Mendelssohn), and throwing aside the prophets, the apostles, and Jesus Christ himself, presenting this stage-writer as opening the gates of the future, for, we must not mistake, under the name of *Christianity*, M. Fontanès has in view the ideas of Lessing, corrected and augmented by those of the liberal school.

But do not let us yield up anything which would encroach upon the truth, or the integrity of our holy books. In Lessing's days Doederlein, Semler, Tuetonius, made imprudent concessions to the dramatist. How did he thank them, and what did they gain in thus exposing the Scriptures?

“Let us have patience, and all these destructive winds of infidelity (even of Germanic infidelity) will pass.”

“ Dans l’abîme immense du temps
Tombent ces recueils importants
D’Historiens, de politiques,
D’interprètes et de critiques,
Qui tous, au mépris du bon sens,
Avec des livres Germaniques,
Se perdent dans la nuit des ans.”—*Card. Bernis.*

But Protestant France is not reduced to feed upon the husks presented to her by her liberal pastors. The well-known Dr E. de Pressensé, the author of “The Three first Centuries of the Church,” (a work which has been crowned by the French Academy), and of the “Life of Jesus” (which has been translated into English, German, and Dutch), has just published a volume entitled *Etudes Evangeliques*. It contains two series of discourses: the first series comprising “The Problem of Suffering,” embraces “The Origin of Suffering,” “The Consolation,” “The Part of Suffering in Conversion,” “Suffering in the Christian Life,” “Suffering for the Truth,” “Compassion.”

All these discourses, which have doubtless been preached in Paris, the city of folly and gaiety, are closely connected together, unless it be the second, perhaps (entitled “Consolation,” upon the text, “Surely He hath borne our griefs”), the title of which does not answer absolutely to the subject which is more directly treated by the author, viz., the “Atonement.”

The second series is of a miscellaneous character: it comprises—“The Voice of the Church and the Cry of the Christian Heart”—“Christian Mysticism”—“The Religious Man’s Sins of the Tongue”—“The Supernatural Confronted by Conscience”—“Mary seated at the Feet of Christ”—“The Jubilee of the French Reformation.”

The favourite vein of the author is the frank and noble defence of the gospel of Jesus Christ, a defence which touches upon all the great questions which the rationalism, the socialism, and the theism of the day pretend to solve. Couched in language correct, elegant, highly-coloured, and sparkling with life, every discourse is an *action*, as our fathers used to say, or a charge right upon the enemy, but which does not prevent the author from slackening his pace now and then, to give us time to stoop and pick up the flowers he lets fall in his course.

Take this among others: “The tears which scald the deepest, are those we check, or those which flow inwardly; these sufferings are like wounds from which the blood does not flow outside; they are the most mortal and incurable” p. 34. Or the following observation, which we would do well to hold continually in remembrance, “lest our feet should slip when we see the prosperity of the wicked:” “It seems sometimes as if God treated the ungrateful man, who desires only enjoyment, as he treated his people in the desert when they lusted after the flesh-pots of Egypt; he overloads with material benefits those who would not have any others, and they sink under this gross prosperity for which they have sold their immortal souls. There are destinies which are terrific” (p. 78).

Again, notice this profound thought, which might well reconcile us

to the sufferings of the present time: "If God had wished to destroy our earth after sin entered into it, He would have left it fair and radiant as at the first; if He had wished to transform it into a hell, he would have left it like a paradise;" an antithesis worthy of Pascal, and which, in our opinion, had no need of the further expansion; He would have given us up to all the corruptions of a licentious happiness, to all the seductions of an impure prosperity (p. 93).*

Speaking of our beloved ones who have left us to be with the Lord, but whose remembrance plunges its roots even deeper into our hearts, the author drops these tender words: "In the family circle the empty place is the place best filled; far from the eyes, near the heart." Yes, our hearts re-echo the words, "dear, and more dear, though now hidden from sight!"

We shall only further quote this one serious warning addressed by Dr de Pressensé to the Christians assembled at Amsterdam, on the 25th of last August; a warning which might well be inscribed upon the walls of all our evangelistic halls and religious committee rooms; "We are quite right to give a large place to practical Christianity, to develop works of charity, and missions; but should the Church become a busy Martha, who has not time to sit, like Mary, at the feet of the divine guest, to hear, contemplate, and adore Him, her activity will take a pharisaical character: charity itself will become a routine, and pride will find its account in the most admirable works." †

Lastly, there is a word for us, pastors, evangelists, missionaries, Bible-readers, &c., for us theologians, for M. de Pressensé himself, who applies his own words to himself; "We do right to ascribe great importance to the development of religious science, and to aim at the consolidation and purity of the faith, in elaborating a deeply-studied theology, which goes straight up to the living, ever-flowing sources of revelation, without, however, laying aside tradition. This is one of the most serious wants of the Church at the present day. But what is theology as soon as it is separated from Jesus Christ? It is but a vain abstraction, a science without an object, a frivolous amusement of

* This thought recalls to us Lord Byron's lines upon Greece in the "Giaour"—

"Strange! that where nature loved to trace,
As if for gods a dwelling place," &c., &c.

But the poet cannot give the explanation of the discordance between nature and man, as the Christian orator does so forcibly.

† The pastor of the Free Church here becomes the eloquent echo of a pastor of the Established Church. The pious Adolphe Monod, complaining, in 1849, with so much reason, of the distractions and worldly occupations which besiege pastors just as much now as they did then, says: "We have thrown ourselves, if not into the 'service of tables,' at least into committees, into deliberations, occupations, editing of journals, managing of charitable institutes, in a word, into many works that do not properly belong to our ministry, and which threaten both to rob us of our precious time, and to weaken our authority. The invasion of outward activity, so apt to take the place of inward life, ought at least to have stopped upon the threshold of *the pastor*; but it has penetrated even into this sanctuary which ought to be impenetrable. Thus the time to prepare our discourses, to visit the flock, 'to rule our own houses' (1 Tim. iii. 4), to pray (that is to do our work), fails us."—V. *Pourquoi je reste dans l'Eglise établie*, p. 57.

the mind, playing with ideas that have neither substance nor reality" (p. 243).

From thoughts let us pass to a few "*tableaux vivants*," for these evangelical studies offer us, in every discourse, one or two pictures before which we like to linger to reflect, as much as to contemplate. The presence of Christ in the Church is thus drawn: "Present by the tender and sacred *remembrance* he has left us, by the faithful and marvellous *recital* the evangelists have furnished us with of his adorable person, He is still more so by his *words*, unlike those of any other, so simple and so great, so true and so profound; inimitable language of eternal truth, manifesting, instead of demonstrating, itself, perfect expression of a charity as tender as it is sincere, all things to all men, supplicating and vehement, the voice of a God, but of a God become man!" But this is not all that the spiritual presence of Christ in his Church implies: this is more or less the past. He is still present with us; "How beautiful the worship where Jesus presides! He is present when we invoke him; not one of our supplications falls to the ground; He does not leave even to the angels the care of receiving them into their golden cups, He gathers them into His sympathising heart; our prayer mingles with His, He marks it with His seal, and sanctioned by His all-powerful *Amen*, it opens the heavens above us, to pour down divine graces in mighty floods! He is present when we open the Book of God; it is not a dead letter to us, through which we spell our way; every word resounds anew as from His own mouth, and becomes an arrow from His quiver, wherewith He sharply pierces our heart and conscience. He himself wields the two-edged sword which "pierceth even to the dividing asunder of joints and marrow!" He is present when the hymn of the Church carries to heaven what words with all their precision cannot express, the unutterable groanings of the spirit, the inmost depths of adoring piety! He is present when the ambassador of truth comes forward to declare the counsel of God. Yes, however unworthy we may be of our calling, we believe that He will not abandon us to our helplessness, and that He deigns to speak sometimes through our lips. Without this hope we would not dare to come up into this pulpit, for we should only bring you our barrenness; but, if He comes up with us, the earthen vessel, fragile though it be, does not the less contain a great treasure. His strength is made perfect in our weakness" (p. 233).

The preacher then passes to speak of The presence of Christ in the *Eucharistic Supper*, and in every place where He is worshipped in *Spirit and in truth*; and ends by depicting the apostolic age in which the promise, *Lo I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world*, was so gloriously accomplished; an age which he holds up before us as the inexorable judge of ours which does not see the Christ. And why? Have we held Him up to view? Have we shewed Him in the life of the Church? (p. 241.)

We have only one remark to make with regard to the discourse upon *Christian mysticism*: It is that, while supposing everywhere the action of the Holy Spirit (with which the presence of Christ is doubtless synonymous in the author's mind) he does not name that Spirit

clearly enough by His *biblical* name, “*The Holy Spirit, the Comforter*” (see John xiv. 25, xv. 26, xvi. 13, 14, &c.). And we would here take occasion to ask our brother why he makes, in general, so few direct or verbal quotations from the Bible in his sermons? He is so reserved in this particular, that it must proceed from a fixed determination, for, if we read his first sermon, “*Humble yourselves*,” delivered in 1848, on the occasion of the events that then took place in France, the same silence in regard to Scripture quotations strikes us. Is it a reaction against the loquacity of more than one preacher, who quote texts in order to avoid the trouble of proving what they advance, or, what is worse, to fill up a gap? Such preaching fills the hearer with *ennui* (but certainly not with the bread of life), while he wonders why he does not feel edified, “for, thinks he, the preacher is quoting Scripture.” Adolphe Monod was also anxious to react against this tendency, and yet his sermons abound in passages brought to bear upon one another, which thus throw light upon, and complete each other, and bring out the wonderful harmony of the whole! He neither followed the superabundance of quotations of the divines of the 16th and 17th centuries, nor the unconnected careless way of stringing passages together of some of our revival preachers. But what is the reason why Dr de Pressensé, and with him almost all our young French preachers, avoid quoting Scripture, or only do so in words of their own? Is it because, being well acquainted both with the substance and with the form, they think their gifts are sufficient? But the infinitely greater gifts of their Master did not prevent His appealing continually to the *letter* of holy writ,—I say expressly *the letter*, because the question is not of appeal to the testimony of the Scriptures,—to that our evangelical brethren always refer. To quote the very *letter* of the Bible is often a way to drive in the nail, for many thus apprehend what our scholastic or literary language left them in the dark about. To quote the *letter* when it is done judiciously, is often to lay hold on the sceptre of divine authority, not merely to encourage the timid, but to awe souls which are too proud to bend beneath the word of a man, but feel themselves forced to yield under the divine pressure. “We are obliged to confess that in the preaching of our day, the accent of authority leaves somewhat to be desired.” Is it because the authority of the preacher has fallen still lower than when Vinet spoke thus, twenty years ago?—Is it because the authority of the Bible, has fallen still lower than ours with some divines (a thing which is indeed infinitely more to be deplored), that we are to silence the voice from heaven, and suppress those words of “*grace, seasoned with salt*”? Will it be answered that our Protestant audiences are sated with the Scriptures? Not more than the synagogue was with Moses, to whom Jesus referred the Jews.

But to return to Dr de Pressensé. We cannot take leave of him without thanking him for the clear way in which he has declared his faith in redemption by the blood of Christ. Read with all the attention they deserve pages 44 and 53, which we would like to quote in full; the *conception* of the atonement which they contain may differ from that of such and such a believer, but every believer who is as honest as one of Dr de Pressensé's opponents, the pious pastor Henriquet, must come to

his conclusion, which is, that Mr de Pressensé, who “presents the atonement as *necessarily uniting perfect obedience with infinite suffering*, believes in a true satisfaction rendered by Jesus Christ to the eternal claims of divine justice.”—(*Archives du Christianisme*, 22d November 1867.)
C. de F.

IX.—GERMAN LITERATURE.

Neue Evangelische Kirchenzeitung.

This excellent journal, which is published weekly, has now completed its ninth year. It is under the editorial care of Messner, one of the professors of theology in the university of Berlin. The editor stands among the foremost of the evangelical theologians. One of the students of Neander, he inherits much of the spirit of his revered teacher, and from the professorial chair, as well as by his ably-conducted journal, and other works that have come from his pen, he exerts a growing influence on the side of evangelical truth.

The *N. E. K.* is the advocate of the union of the Reformed and Lutheran churches, while the *Evangelische Kirchenzeitung*, edited by Hengstenberg, is opposed to the union, and advocates the cause of the old high Lutheran party. During the past year there has been a great deal of controversy among the theologians in Prussia on the subject of the union. The manner in which the union was originally brought about, and the sufferings endured by those who shewed an opposition to the royal will in this matter, will account for much of the violence of that recoil which has driven the several parties into an attitude of hostility to each other. Party strife during the past year on this question has risen very high. The journals have ever and anon returned to it; pastoral conferences, jubilee celebrations, and royal ordonnances, and diverse publications, have all served to swell the tumult; nor is the subject at all settled, or likely soon to be.

In a recent number of the *N. E. K.* there is a critical notice of a German translation of the now almost forgotten *Ecce Homo*, which has been published at Erlangen. The reviewer takes the author to task, and exposes the weak points of the book. He sees through the elaborate ornamentation of words in which the author presents his thoughts, and discovers that the book is the production of a man ignorant of what Christianity really is. In Germany they have had much to do with works of such a sort. By a kind of mental chemistry they resolve all the fine words into so much vapour, which passes off into the air, and leaves the residuum of solid thought, which can be taken up and analysed. Tested by such a process, the reviewer seems to find that the residuum of this book is of very little value. “The author,” says he, “has gained very little from Christianity. In England the work lying before us has entered its sixth edition. It is doubtful whether it will have a similar success

amongst us, because we have already enough of *such-like* bungling compositions, and in a more agreeable form than this one."

Among the many works which issued from the German press during the past year, we mention the two following as works of special interest:—

Dorner's Geschichte der Protestantischen Theologie.

Dorner is one of the professors of theology at Berlin. He is the author of the extensive and valuable *Entwickelungs-geschichte von der Person Christi*, and is at present entitled to take rank side by side with Hengstenberg, if he is not indeed in many points his superior. His *History of Protestant Theology* is a contribution of permanent value, and we know none in Germany so capable of doing justice to the subject as Dorner.

Martin Chemnitz nach seinem Leben und Wirken. Von Hermann Hachfeld. Leipzig.

This book belongs to that peculiar class of works, of which the historian Neander was the founder. It is a monography. The design of this style of writing, as introduced by Neander, is to fix upon some leading personage in an epoch, and, in connection with his history, to portray the characteristic features of his age, and the tendencies of thought which developed themselves on the field of history. Monographs now hold a very prominent place in German literature, and are of especial value, as affording facilities for the study of church history. His monography is well written, and contains valuable information on the events of the period in which Chemnitz lived. We have here particularly an insight into the once famous Osiandrian controversy on the relation between justification and sanctification, and into the history and character of the Council of Trent. The age to which Chemnitz belonged was one of almost ceaseless agitations and controversy among the theologians, particularly in the Lutheran Church.

Theologisches Universal Lexikon. 1st Lieferung. London: Williams & Norgate.

This is the first part of a *Universal Theological Lexicon*, now in course of publication at Elberfeld, for the use of the clergy and educated laymen. When completed, it will consist of two vols. of about 1000 double-column pages, large 8vo, each, and cost 5 thalers. It is designed to present a brief summary of information on every subject—doctrinal, historical, biographical, &c., within the region of theology and its related sciences, and to serve as a guide to other sources of information. Its stand-point is that of evangelical Protestantism. It cannot fail to be most useful as a handbook.

Zeitschrift für die Historische Theologie. II. Heft. 1868.

The first article in this excellent journal of historical theology is on *Contributions to the Church History of Holland*, and consists of a re-

view of three recent Dutch works on that subject. The first of these works is by Professor Molb of Amsterdam, who is *κατ' ἐξοχήν*, the master of Dutch Church History. It treats of the history of the middle ages. The second is by Professor Hoekstra of Amsterdam, and treats of the Reformation period. The third is by Dr Sepp of Leyden, and presents the development of the theological and ecclesiastical movements of the past century. The article thus furnishes a condensed view of the Church History of the Netherlands.

The second article is from the pen of Dr Herzog of Erlangen, and presents an interesting account of the sad history of the family of Jean Calas of Toulouse, and of the conduct of Voltaire in connection with it. One of Calas' sons, in a fit of melancholy, committed suicide. The rumour was industriously circulated among the Roman Catholics that the father had murdered his son, to prevent his avowing himself a convert to Romanism. The suicide was canonised as a martyr. The fanaticism of the Catholics demanded that the father should be put to death. The French Parliament decreed that he should be broken upon the wheel. The remaining sons of the unhappy Calas were compelled to renounce the Protestant faith, and the daughters were placed in a monastery. Voltaire having been made acquainted with the facts of the case, two years afterwards brought the whole matter under public notice. The case was reinvestigated by the tribunals, and the innocence of Calas was placed in the clearest light. As a compensation for the injury that had been done to the family of Calas, Louis XV. granted them 80,000 livres. The public agitation connected with this trial and its results, contributed in some degree toward the securing for the Protestants of France that legal recognition afterwards guaranteed to them by the edict of Versailles (1787.)

The other articles in this number are, an account of the *Persecution of Jeremias Braun of Basil*, being a contribution to the history of the persecution of the Protestants in Switzerland; and the *History of the Fanatic John Tennhardt*, "chancery clerk of the heavenly majesty," who died 1720.

Allgemeiner Literarischer Anzeiger für das Evangelische Deutschland.
No. 2. 1867.

This journal supplies a *vidimus* of all the works from time to time published in Germany. It embraces the whole range of literature, art, and music. We have no work of the same kind published in this country. It is like a descriptive catalogue, conveying, at the same time, a critical estimate of the publications noticed, grouping together those that treat of the same, or of kindred subjects, and then presenting an outline of the course of thought developed.

For example, in the number before us there is presented, first, "a critical survey of the pamphlets that have recently appeared on the subject of the confession, and the government of the church in the provinces newly acquired by Prussia." The question has been very keenly debated among theologians and politicians, whether the union of the Lutheran and the Reformed, which prevails elsewhere in Prussia, should be extended to the provinces acquired by the recent war. Then there follow (1.) *A Review of the most recent Literature*

on the subject of *Geology*; and (2.) *A Review of Illustrated Periodicals*. From this we quote the following statements:—"From 1853 to 1867 there were published over an *hundred* separate illustrated periodicals, exclusive of those designed for children, and those which belong to the department of art." (3.) *A Review of Works on Music*. It contains also an extensive array of extracts from the critical notices of books found in other periodicals, together with a general review of the principal German works that have appeared during the first six months of 1867.

Such a journal as this is highly useful to all who seek to acquaint themselves with what is doing in the great book markets of Germany.

Geschichte der Amerikanischen Urreligionen. Von Dr J. G. Müller, O. Professor in Basel. Basel Schweighauserische Verlagsbuchhandlung. London and Edinburgh: Williams & Norgate. 1867. Zweite Unveränderte Auflage. 8vo. 706s.

This work presents a history of the religious systems of the different tribes of American Indians. It consists of two parts. The *first* treats of the religion of the savage tribes; and the *second*, of that of the tribes which may be regarded as more or less civilised.

In the *first* part there is an account (1.) of the religion of the North-American Redskins; (2.) of that of the inhabitants of the Great Antilles; (3.) of that of the Caribbees; and (4.) of that of the eastern South Americans.

In part *second* we find an account of the religious history of (1.) the Peruvians; (2.) the inhabitants of the northern part of South America, north of Quito and the Amazon, called "terra firma;" (3.) the Mexicans.

Dr Müller has with the greatest industry examined all the sources of information, and brought together, in a most readable, and deeply interesting form, a great amount of historical information. This work is intended to be a handbook on the whole subject of which it treats, and it admirably fulfils its purpose. It is enriched with a complete index.

Geschichte der Biblischen Literatur und des Judisch-hellenistischen Schriftthums. Historisch und Kritisch behandelt von Dr Julius Fürst, Prof. an der Universität zu Leipzig. *Erster Band.* 1867. London and Edinburgh: Williams & Norgate.

Dr Fürst is well known as the distinguished author of a *Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon to the Old Testament*, which has recently been translated into English by Dr Samuel Davidson. He is a worthy successor to Dr Gesenius as a leading Hebrew scholar in Germany.

In the preface to the work before us the author says, "The knowledge of the literature of any nation, especially of that which contributes to the education and spiritual elevation of the people, ought not to be the subject of inquiry only to the learned classes. The instruction in the sciences, and the popularising of an acquaintance with medicine, astronomy, and with the science of languages now enjoyed by the people is proof of this. The national literature of the ancient

Israelites, as well as that of the New Testament writings, which are usually called "the Biblical literature," ought the less to form an exception, inasmuch as, from their peculiar historical development, and the religious and ethical import of their contents, they have become the literature of the world, the possession of the nations. The people have the right to demand an exposition of a literature which contains for them their religious and moral *magna charta*, and which is most intimately connected with their education and culture. The exposition of a literature which belongs to a remote and obscure antiquity, can only be satisfactorily conducted by an unprejudiced historical investigation, uninfluenced by dogmatic and religious prepossessions. The theologians and the clergy have often condemned a popularising of the history of Biblical literature. The divines, who regard themselves as the appointed mediators and interpreters, have, during the war of blind faith with rational sceptical criticism, kept the people out of the temple of Bible knowledge, rather have turned them away from the Bible. It seemed to me a pressing necessity of the times,—in which, more than ever, investigation is made into the foundations of the law, and the springs of historical, moral, and religious knowledge,—to search into the ancient national literature of the Israelites, and of the New Testament, the chief springs of our whole civilisation, and to offer the results of my historical research as a present to the people." Such is the spirit and aim of Dr Fürst's book, which is to consist of two volumes, the first of which we have now before us. It consists of 490 pp. 8vo. It comprehends a review of the Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua, and the period of history embraced by them. The author's views of inspiration, which regulate his method of dealing with the different questions that successively arise, are essentially defective. For this reason, there is much we would decidedly object to, in the tone and form of some of his disquisitions. At the same time, one feels, on reading the different sections, that the author has a profound acquaintance with all that appertains to the literature of the subject. For example, it will be difficult to find a more interesting and ably written specimen of historical criticism than is presented in the introduction to the work, whether we can agree with all the conclusions arrived at or not. It treats of questions of an ethnographic character—the language of the ancient Israelites, and the origin of their national literature. A work on the plan of Fürst's, conducted in the reverent spirit of one who holds to Scripture as in all its parts, historical and doctrinal, a record formed by men who wrote "as they were moved by the Holy Ghost," is yet a desideratum. This of Dr Fürst's is largely imbued with the rationalising spirit yet unhappily so common in Germany.

Zum Evangelium des Paulus und des Petrus. Altes und neues von Carl Holsten, Dr phil. Lehrer am Gymnasium zu Rostock. Rostock: Stillerische Hofbuchlandlung. London and Edinburgh: Williams and Norgate. 1868. 8vo. 446 s.

The author dedicates his work to Ferdinand Christian Baur, "the departed, but not dead" (*dem gestorbenen aber nicht toten*), as he describes him. The book consists of four essays, some portions of which have been already published (1855-1861). The first essay is on

Paul's vision of Christ (1 Cor. xv. 8), and the genesis of Paul's gospel. The second, discusses Peter's vision of the Messiah. The third, unfolds the contents and course of thought developed in the Epistle to the Galatians; and the fourth is an elaborate dissertation on the meaning of the word *σάββ* in the epistles of Paul. The writer displays a great deal of ingenuity, and a vast amount of critical ability, but unhappily the reasoning is throughout vitiated by the rationalism of the author. The book is interesting, as exhibiting the nature of the speculations indulged in by the school to which he belongs; but it is not likely, we think, to be of very much service one way or another.

Der Kampf der Lutherischen Kirche um Luther's Lehre vom Abendmahl im Reformationszeitalter. Von D. H. Schmid, O. Professor der Theologie in Erlangen, Leipzig. London and Edinburgh: Williams & Norgate. 1868. 8vo. 372 s.

This is a work of very great importance. In a very lucid and comprehensive manner it presents a history of the doctrinal controversy on the subject of the Lord's Supper, which was agitated in the Lutheran Church during the time of the Reformation, viewed in connection with the whole doctrinal developments of that age.

The book is divided into two parts. In the first part there is, 1. A minute and circumstantial account of the controversy to the time of the Wittenberg Concordium (1536)—(1.) Luther and Bucer; (2.) Luther and the Swiss. 2. A discussion of the question, "Has Luther's doctrine of the Supper found its expression in the Confessions of the Lutheran Church?" 3. A discussion of the question, "Has the confessional position of the Lutheran Church been changed by the alteration Melancthon made in the Augustana (The Augsburg Confession)?"

In the second part we have, first, a history of the *Interim*, the Augsburg and Leipzig. There is then (1.) A lengthened history of the controversy in Westphalia. (2.) The Bremen controversy. (3.) The controversy in the Palatinate. (4.) The appearance of the Würtemberg theologians in the strife. (5.) The drama in Saxony. (6.) The efforts of the princes to establish peace in the Church.

Such a work as this, so complete in its details, and so well arranged, as well as so calm and impartial in its tone, is worthy of a permanent place in our theological literature.

X.—AMERICAN LITERATURE.

Cyclopædia of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature.
By Rev. JOHN M'CLINTOCK, D.D., and JAMES STRONG, S.T.D.
New York: Harper & Brothers. 1867. Vol. 1, A.B.

This is a goodly volume of about 950 double-column pages, large 8vo. It is the first of a series of six volumes, of which the work, when completed, will consist. In point of typography and general appearance it leaves nothing to be desired. It is copiously illustrated.

The work, of which we have here the first instalment, will occupy a place in Theological Literature peculiarly its own. We have nothing like it in this country, in the comprehensive completeness of its design. Hertzog's massive *Real-encyclopädie für Protestantische Theologie und Kirche*, is the only work in Germany which comes anything near it.

In BIBLICAL LITERATURE this cyclopædia will be as complete as any of these admirable works recently published in our own country, "Smith's Dictionary of the Bible," "Kitto's Cyclopædia of Biblical Literature," or "Fairbairn's Imperial Bible Dictionary," all of which are avowedly made free use of by the editors. So far as this first volume is concerned, we frankly confess that we place the American work by no means behind these we have mentioned. Its articles are as ably written. They are at once scientific and practical, and breathe throughout an evangelical, reverent spirit. Its wider scope enables its accomplished editors to treat even some Biblical topics in a much more comprehensive manner than is done in any of the above named British works. For example, under the word *Atonement*, this volume presents a very full and elaborate view, in about eight pages, of the whole doctrine in its Biblical and historical aspects, with a very complete *vidimus* of the literature of the subject, English and Foreign as well as American. The article is written in a fair and candid spirit. The young theologian will obtain as much information from a careful reading of it as he would acquire from the perusal of many volumes. It maps out the whole region covered by the doctrine, and enables the student to follow out farther research with ease and accuracy. Indeed, we are surprised at the vast amount of information, and so well arranged, which the editors have contrived to condense into this one article.

In the department of THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE, there will be found a comprehensive account of the *Doctrines* of Christianity in general, with their history; of the *Creeds* of the various churches, and the peculiar *Tenets* of each ecclesiastical body; of the *Heresies* that have at various times appeared, and of the *Controversies* that have been agitated.

The department of CHURCH HISTORY will contain a series of articles on the rise, progress, and present condition of the *various divisions* of the Christian church; on the *history* of Christianity in each important country, together with an account of the various *sees*, *dioceses*, and *local subdivisions* of each branch of the church, of the *councils* that have been held at different times, the *monastic orders*, and the *ecclesiastical statistics* of every church and country.

The articles in the department of RELIGIOUS BIOGRAPHY will present a complete and detailed account of every person of eminence that has appeared, both in ancient and modern times, in the history of the church. In a word, in this work the student will find classified under general titles, and all under one alphabet, all the items of SACRED TECHNOLOGY. The first volume amply fulfils the promise of the editors. If the work is carried on to its completion in the same masterly and thorough style in which it has been begun, it will prove one of the most valuable treasures within reach of the theological student.

In this country, and in Germany, a great many cyclopædias devoted to special departments, theological, geographical, Biblical, Bibliographical, ecclesiastical, &c., have from time to time been published. This work from the transatlantic press freely quotes all that is important from these cyclopædias. It contains the cream of many cyclopædias and works of reference. But, besides this, there is engaged on it a numerous staff of original contributors, men of eminence in their several departments, and from different sections of the Christian church, both in Europe and America. We do not depreciate the valuable cyclopædias of Biblical literature that have recently appeared in our own country, but this American one has excellencies altogether its own. We give it our hearty commendation, and hope that it will find its way into not a few of our public and private libraries. If the student of theology can obtain this work, he will need no other. It will supply him with comprehensive and accurate information on every subject appertaining to the wide department of Biblical, theological, and ecclesiastical literature, and direct him to the various sources by an investigation of which he may prosecute his researches on any topic.

History of the Christian Church. By PHILIP SCHAFF, D.D. From the Birth of Christ to the time of Gregory the Great (A.D. 1-600). 2 vols. New York : Charles Scribner & Co., 1867.

Dr Schaff is by birth a Swiss, but in theological training and in habits of thought and forms of expression he is a German of distinct Lutheran tendencies. Some years ago, when, as a young man fresh from the University, he was called to occupy the important place of Professor in the Theological Seminary of Mercersburg, Pennsylvania, he found that seminary already influenced by the teachings of Dr Niven, who, judging from his book on "The Mystical Presence" (Philadelphia, 1846), was animated by a very strong Romanising spirit. The book was, indeed, offensively unprotestant in its tone. Being associated with Dr Nevin in the general affairs of the seminary, as well as in conducting the *Mercersburg Review*, he fell under the suspicion of sympathising with him in his peculiar views of doctrine. This, together perhaps with a want of duly appreciating the influence of his early education on his mode of expressing himself, may to some extent account for the severity with which some of Dr Schaff's earlier writings, particularly his excellent "History of the Apostolic Church," first published about eighteen years ago, have been canvassed by reviewers. There are, undoubtedly, forms of expression in that work which are open in our opinion to grave animadversion, yet we do not hesitate to place it in the very foremost rank in point of general ability. The reader will find himself in the company of a man of no ordinary talent and learning. He is expected, however, to be a student who will not accept the conclusions or reasonings of the writer without investigation. The work before us is a sequel to that earlier "History." It has just been issued by the eminent American publishers, Scribner & Co., New York, simultaneously with an edition in German from the Leipzig

press. In a brief notice, we cannot do justice to our sense of the value of this noble work. With reference to the second volume, "From Constantine the Great to Gregory the Great," Dr Schaff says, "In preparing this part of my Church history for the press, I have been deprived of the stimulus of an active professorship, and been much interrupted in consequence of other labours, a visit to Europe, and the loss of a part of the manuscript, which had to be rewritten. But, on the other hand, I have had the great advantage of constant and free access to several of the best libraries of the country."

The author prepared the manuscript in his own native language, the German. The Rev. Dr Yeomans, of Rochester, translated most of it, as he had done the "History of the Apostolic Church," into English. In point of style and general structure, there is nothing to indicate that the book is a translation from the German. Indeed, in these respects it will stand a favourable comparison with the best English classics. The narrative flows on in an easy graceful rhythm, making it most pleasant for the reader to peruse the deeply interesting narrative of the Church history, as it is here related, in all its diverse lights and shadows. In the history of the Church during the first six centuries, we see Christianity in its bloom on the old classic soil. In the first three centuries, we are brought into contact with the Christianity of the apostles and martyrs. During the second three centuries we see Christianity "still moving upon the same geographical scene of the Græco-Roman Empire and the ancient classical culture—the countries around the Mediterranean Sea. But its field and its operation are materially enlarged, and even touch the barbarians on the limits of the Empire. Above all, its relation to the temporal power and its social and political position and import undergo an entire and permanent change. We have here to do with the Church of the Græco-Roman Empire, and with the beginning of Christianity among the Germanic barbarians." Under the able guidance of Dr Schaff, we are led out and in among all the diverse scenes and incidents of that deeply interesting history, so that, as with panoramic vividness, we see rising up before us the venerable apostles and martyrs, the patriarchs and emperors of that age, and become witnesses of all their actions, by which they gave a direction to the current of the Church's history, which, in a great measure, it has retained to the present day. There is such a fulness and completeness in the narrative, and everywhere such evidences of thorough and honest research into all the sources, that we feel warranted in saying that henceforth it will be regarded as *the* History of the Ancient Church. In no part of the work have we found any traces of an undue leaning to any side, or of anything approaching to an attempt to support a pre-conceived theory. Dr Schaff carries forward his work with all the dignity and impartiality of a true historian, and we thank him for this splendid monument of his industry.

XI.—CRITICAL NOTICES.

The Congregational Year Book. 1868.

This formidable-looking book attests at once the vast progress which Congregationalism has made, and the high degree of organisation which it has attained. It embraces, indeed, a wide range, comprehending Congregationalism all over the world; and the size of the volume is greatly owing to the long addresses, reports, and memorials of departed ministers which it contains. Looking to England alone, the number of their ministers amounts to nearly 2000. Ministers connected with the Board in and about London number 173, besides many others not connected with the Board. Several things have struck us on perusing these records. In the first place, we are gratified by observing the increasing care which our Congregational brethren are manifesting to secure a higher degree of literary and theological culture for the future ministry of their communion; the anxiety they display to prevent those miserable schisms which too often split up their congregations into small fragments, and their determination to raise the salaries of their ministers. In the next place, we have marked with satisfaction a disposition to accommodate their terms of communion to something more nearly approaching those of other non-conforming churches; and, instead of demanding positive marks of conversion, to content themselves with "a credible profession of Christianity." The present volume is ushered in with what they term a "Declaration of Faith," which, so far as it goes, appears to us unexceptionably sound and scriptural. True, care is taken to inform us that "it is not intended this should be put forth with any authority, or as a standard to which assent should be required." "Disallowing the utility of creeds and articles of religion as a bond of union, and protesting against subscription to any human formularies as a term of communion, Congregationalists are willing to declare, for general information, what is commonly believed among them, reserving to every one the most perfect liberty of conscience." We do not see the use of all this fencing against creeds and confessions. A declaration of faith seems to us very much the same thing as a confession of faith; and, as this is plainly a *joint* declaration, indicating the belief of all the members of the Congregational union, we do not see why it may not be regarded as constituting, so far as doctrinal articles are concerned, a *bond of union* between them. There may have been no formal subscription of these articles, but, should any minister preach tenets subversive of them,—should he openly deny the Holy Trinity, denounce the atonement, and treat the work of the Holy Spirit in conversion as mere fanaticism, we presume he would no longer be retained or recognised as a member of the Union. How this separation may be effected, is a mere matter of form. Our Congregational friends declare that "no church or union of churches has any right or power to interfere with the faith or discipline of any other church, further than to separate from such as in faith or practice depart from the gospel of Christ." The idea of the Congregational Union of England, some 2000 strong, separating themselves from a single erring brother or church, sounds somewhat grotesque; but, practically, it amounts to a rejection of the heretic; and as to "reserving to every one the most perfect liberty of conscience," unless they mean the toleration of all sorts of heresy within the pale of their communion, which they denounce as one of the crying evils of the English establishment, we do not see that it can amount to more than what all Protestant churches concede to every one in this land of freedom. We cannot help regretting, therefore, that

our brethren should have thought it necessary to put in so many caveats against supposing that they had adopted something like a general creed or confession of faith. In the last place, we congratulate our brethren on their having attained something like organisation. We are no sticklers for names, a Congregational Union is a very fair definition of what we call a synod or general assembly; the chairman, were it not associated with political and convivial club meetings, might sound as sweet as "moderator" or any other name; and "resolutions" moved and carried, may do the business without assuming the judicial robes of "Acts of Assembly." In virtue of this unity of action, by which Congregationalism is substantially assimilated to Presbyterianism, the Union has become at last a moral force in England. We may point, for instance, to the firm stand which the Union has taken against the overtures of the Broad School party to form along with them a comprehensive national establishment. We observe that Dr Vaughan, in his address, speaks of presbytery as a system of "compulsion," and says, "Your system has in it too much machinery—is too cautious—too distrustful; if I may dare say so, it is too Scotch for us. It may be good for Scotland, but it does seem to us to be wanting in that pliancy, in that loyalty to the right of private judgment, in that power to confide in the force and worth of individuality, which are so characteristic of our English ways." There is a vague generality in this mode of dealing with the subject, which renders it rather difficult to grapple with it, and yet it does seem hopeful that the stern, warlike objections of former Independents are now dwindling down to such shadowy phantoms as "Scotch and English ways." We can assure Dr Vaughan that we "dislike that word 'compulsion' in religious matters," fully as much as our Congregational brethren; and, perhaps, our views of what has been called church power and authority might be found not to differ so much from those which they entertain as they may imagine. There is nothing which we condemn more heartily than the assumption, by the servants of Christ, of magisterial airs, and a disposition to play the despot by imposing upon Christian congregations a rule of rigid uniformity; and perhaps, as our Congregational friends have been led by the force of circumstances, we shall not say to borrow, but to adopt, the common counsel and united action of presbytery, it might be well for Presbyterian churches to learn from them that Christian congregations and their ministers are entitled to a certain degree of Christian liberty, quite compatible with their walking and working together in the bond of a brotherly union.

The Increase of Faith. W. Blackwood & Sons: Edinburgh and London. 1868.

The earnest thoughtfulness and evangelical piety displayed in this little treatise have afforded us no small gratification. The writer, whoever he may be, professes to aim at a practical rather than a scientific exposition of the doctrine; but he is evidently well read in theology, and has studied the question so far at least as to pronounce his opinions with considerable decision. We regret that in some of these opinions we cannot coincide. Indeed, to us he seems throughout to labour under a fallacy or misconception in regard to the whole subject, which tends to mar the practical design of his treatise. We refer to his views on what has been called the assurance of faith, or the question whether assurance is of the essence of faith. On this subject, he has fallen into the misapprehension which so generally prevails, that our first Reformers, and those who have followed them, make saving faith to consist in "*the believer being assured that he is himself in a state of grace and salvation.*" He refers to the authority of Sir William Hamilton, who says, "Assurance, personal assurance, the

feeling that God is propitious to me, that my sins are forgiven, was long universally held in the Protestant communities to be the criterion and condition of a true and saving faith, . . . and is part and parcel of all confessions of all the churches of the Reformation down to the Westminster Assembly." "In that synod," he adds, "assurance (that is personal assurance) was, in Protestantism, for the first time, declared not to be of the essence of faith." A less trustworthy "authority," than Sir William Hamilton, on questions connected with evangelical truth, or the opinions of our Reformers, cannot well be conceived. In the present case, he has quite mistaken the meaning and design of the language employed by our Reformers. Their object clearly was to oppose what is called in our National Covenant, "the doubtful faith of the Pope," referring to the popish doctrine which stripped faith of everything like certitude, and kept the sinner dangling in suspense about his salvation, in order to uphold more effectually the power of priestly absolution, and the virtue of churchly rites. In sharp contrast to this hesitating mood—this slavish trembling of the soul under the terror of divine wrath, only to be appeased, though never wholly quelled, by almsgiving and penance, our Reformers taught that faith, from its very nature was *fiducial*; that it was a trusting, a confident reliance in Christ for salvation; and that, as it rested on the merits of an all-sufficient Saviour, held forth in the never-failing promise of God, it must carry in its very bosom an assurance flowing from the sureness of what it rested upon. Along with this, and corresponding with the overtures of salvation which are addressed personally to every sinner, they contended that true faith included also a personal appropriation of Christ and all his saving benefits. By holding this assurance to be of the essence of faith, they did not intend to teach that every true believer must be assured that he is personally in a state of grace and salvation. They could distinguish between what was essential to the grace itself, and what was incidental to the person who possessed it. There might be many doubts in the heart of the *believer*,—there could be no doubting in faith itself. There is no inconsistency in supposing that the true believer may be deeply troubled with doubts and fears, but faith in itself stands directly opposed to all doubting and fearing. It is obviously in this sense that we must understand the definition of saving faith in the Palatine Confession. "True faith is an assured confidence . . . by which I rest upon God, assuredly holding that, by God's mercy, and on account of Christ's merits, not only to others but to me also, the remission of sins, eternal righteousness and life *are given*." From the emphasizing of these words, *ARE GIVEN*, it is evident that our author takes them to mean an assurance that these blessings have been actually bestowed, but it is apparent from the expression, "*Not only to others but to me also*," that the meaning is, that these blessings were freely offered in the gift of the gospel *to me* as a sinner as well as to *all others*. In no other sense could the gift of these blessings be considered as the object of faith. If the meaning were that the person was confident that pardon, righteousness, and life, had been actually conferred upon him, his confidence in this case must have arisen from an inward consciousness that he had received them; in other words, it would express the assurance of sense and not of faith. Faith has to do simply with the divine testimony, but as there is nothing in the Word of God assuring any individual that he is pardoned and saved, no such thing can be the proper object of faith. We may believe in the love of God towards us, because that is matter of divine testimony, but if we meant to express our love towards God, we do not say that we believe in that love,—it is matter of personal experience, the result of self-examination, and it may be the fruit of the Spirit witnessing with our spirit. This distinction between the assurance of *faith* and the assurance of *sense*, old as it is, and oft repeated, seems to

be as necessary as ever to a right understanding of the subject. We feel persuaded, moreover, that a due attention to it is quite sufficient to guard against the two extremes which the present writer seems so anxious to avoid, namely, that "of giving way to useless and needless despondency, on the one hand, or settling down into a state of even more perilous contentment with imperfect attainment on the other." It is equally certain that the chapter in our Confession on "Assurance of Grace and Salvation," which Sir William Hamilton supposes to have taught for the first time, that assurance is not of the essence of faith, has nothing whatever to do with that question, but refers exclusively to the assurance of sense, or inward consciousness of a personal interest in Christ.

Had space permitted, we should have liked to enter more fully into the subject. We are not sure if we understand what our author exactly means by "Increase of Faith." The expression is certainly not distinctively a Scriptural one. The disciples, no doubt, on one occasion, prayed, "Lord, increase our faith," but our Lord, by replying, "If ye have faith as a grain of mustard seed," &c., intimates that it was not the amount but the reality of faith that was mainly desirable. We read, indeed, of them that are weak in the faith, but this refers to weak-minded Christians, or persons who from ignorance of the principles of the faith are apt to be shaken and stumbled, in opposition to others who like Abraham, are "strong in faith," that is, who through faith are made strong to do valiantly, and through faith waxed stronger and stronger. Christians need to be established in the faith, "grounded and settled," and an unwavering faith which yields to no doubt, distrust, or fear, is what all ought to pray for and seek after, but this is surely different from conceiving of faith as something in a constant flux, mounting up to higher and higher degrees of certitude. Our author is quite mistaken when he states in a note (p. 20) that "Calvin often recognises different degrees of faith as consistent with salvation, and that there may be a true faith which is not firm and certain." The language of Calvin, which he quotes from the Institutes, amounts to no more than what we have already admitted, namely, that the true believer may be often tossed with doubts and fears, but he never meant to deny that true faith when in exercise must be defined as *Divine erga nos benevolentia firmam certamque cognitionem*. The author adds, when our Lord said to Nicodemus that, "Whosoever believeth in him shall have everlasting life," he does not say, "Whosoever believeth *much*." Precisely so, and we could desire nothing better to shew the absurdity of pleading for degrees of certitude in faith. Our author admits "that Christian faith consists in a reliance upon Jesus Christ for salvation." Can we conceive of a person relying upon Christ, *more or less*, for salvation? Or, supposing that one has committed to us some important trust, how would we feel were he to address us thus, "I trust you *a little* indeed, but I cannot say that I trust you *much*. I have no firm or complete reliance upon you." Would not this amount in reality to a want of trust? Is this, indeed, all the trust that we have to give to Christ? The simplest Christian feels that this would not be faith. "I suppose," said the old woman to Dr Chalmers, when he was endeavouring to point out to her the duty of entire and implicit reliance upon the Saviour, as all that was needful for salvation, "you mean, Sir, that I should just *lippen* to Him?" "That," said the Dr, "is the very thing." It is needless to say more. We regret the unsatisfactoriness and the confusion of thought which the unhappy misconception we have pointed out, imparts to a treatise otherwise well fitted to advance the interests of Christian piety.

Lamps, Pitchers, and Trumpets. Lectures delivered to Students for the Ministry. By EDWIN PAXTON HOOD. London : Jackson, Walford, & Hodder. 1867.

Under this quaint title, Mr Paxton Hood has produced a volume replete with ingenious reflections and racy illustrations of what he styles "the genius and success of the pulpit,—its method and its power." For the treatment of this subject in a manner fitted at once to interest, to impress, and to improve his readers, Mr Hood possesses peculiar qualifications. Himself a preacher of no mean order, with a genius in its own way, original, graphic, and pictorial, with a mind teeming with ancient lore and modern literature, few men are more fitted to throw a charm over the whole theme, and inspire the youthful candidate for the ministry with ardent love for his profession, to guide his taste, and to direct him to the mode of presenting the truth most congenial to the present age. The topics selected in these lectures are varied, but all bearing on the one great point of effective preaching, showing how the preacher should enlighten as a lamp, arouse as a trumpet, and convey soul refreshment as a pitcher—in short, to preach as Paul and Barnabas did, who "so spake that a great multitude believed." After a series of striking monographs, including Paul, Chrysostom, St Bernard, Puritan Adams and Christmas Evans, we have a full length portraiture of Charles Spurgeon,—evidently written *con amore*, and with a singularly discriminative estimate of that remarkable preacher. Mr Hood does not profess to lay down formal rules for pulpit composition, but nowhere will there be found more judicious or better-timed advices to the young preacher, administered in a style of playful humour and kindly feeling which cannot fail to recommend them to his acceptance. Among the monographs, it would be unpardonable to omit noticing with special admiration Mr Hood's masterly sketch of the Apostle Paul. It is full of life, and, with all the eloquence of enthusiasm, never rises into extravagance. In short, the whole volume deserves the serious perusal of all students of divinity, and cannot fail to furnish important hints to all engaged in the work of the Christian ministry.

Studies in the Book of Psalms. Being a Critical and Expository Commentary, with Doctrinal and Practical Remarks on the Entire Psalter. By WILLIAM S. PLIMER, D.D., LL.D. Philadelphia : J. B. Lippincott & Co. Edinburgh : A. & C. Black. 1867.

This substantial volume is intended chiefly for the use of ministers, containing a full exposition of the text, and giving a synopsis of the various commentators on the Psalms in all ages, from the days of Athanasius and Theodoret, down to those of Piscator and Michaelis, Horsley and Alexander. The authorship, the dates, the allusions, and characters of the Psalms, are carefully examined, and the verdict of the author on the various opinions of critics is pronounced with great judgment and discrimination. Such a work must have cost a world of labour, and an amount of research which few Biblical students can be expected to overtake in those days, when the task of pastoral superintendence renders it next to impossible to consult a tithe of the multitudinous authorities cited by Dr Plimer. The service thus rendered to the Church, it will be difficult to estimate. It is like being admitted to a conference of the whole Church on the Book of Psalms. Thus, in the introduction to the 119th Psalm, we have the opinions of no less than twenty-seven ancient and modern interpreters ; and who would not listen with special interest to the united wisdom and experience of such a conclave, were we admitted to

hear them personally, giving the results of their meditation upon such a noble piece of holy Scripture? Occasionally, indeed, there is a superfluity of such references; for example, on the title of the 16th Psalm, "Michtam of David," where we have an array of no less than twenty-eight opinions of critics, many of them identical; and, after all, in the opinion of the compiler himself, the phrase signifies nothing more than a "Writing of David." The volume, however, must prove eminently serviceable to all who wish to become thoroughly acquainted with the literature of the book of Psalms.

Lectures on Early Scripture : Patriarchal Epoch. By H. F. CROSSE, D.C.L., Member of the Hon. Society of the Inner Temple, Incumbent of Holy Trinity, and Rural Dean of Hastings. Second Edition. London: Longmans, Green, & Co. 1867.

This book is rather unhappily got up. In the first place, it is unhappy in its title page, which is too vague and general, and might have been prefixed to a hundred other volumes, with which the public has been lately flooded. "Lectures on Early Scripture" is a title which gives no idea of the special character and design of the work, which, in fact, is a series of dissertations and demonstrations, embracing some of the most profound questions connected with holy writ. In the next place, were it not for the list of contents prefixed, it would be impossible for the reader to know what subject the author was treating of. The lectures themselves have neither titles, texts, nor head-lines, so that the reader who wishes to know what the author means to speak about, must either travel back to the beginning of the volume, or patiently trudge on in ignorance to its close. But with these abatements, and in spite of them, we have been arrested and charmed by the perusal of this volume. It is replete with original thought, profound reflection, and striking argument. The author informs us, that though at first delivered in the shape of sermons, it has been recast, and the matter has been generally transferred from a didactic to an argumentative tone. The sentiments of the writer are sound and evangelical; but what has specially delighted us in perusing these lectures, is to see a mind so richly imbued with the spirit of genuine philosophy bowing with such profound reverence before the shrine of holy Scripture, and bringing it out in harmony with the wisdom, power, and goodness of God. In an age when our would-be philosophers seem to take a pride and pleasure in finding out discrepancies between Scripture and science, it is truly refreshing to see such a writer as Mr Crosse, at once a scholar, a lawyer, and a divine, devoting his energies to the noble task, not merely of vindicating Scripture, but by placing it in its true light, commending it to the admiration and homage of mankind. We shall await with much interest the promised sequel of these valuable lectures.

Imaginism and Rationalism : an Explanation of the Origin and Progress of Christianity. By JOHN VICKERS. London: Trübner & Co., Paternoster Row. 1867.

Some idea of the scope and tenor of this wretched production may be gathered from the first sentence of its introduction. "Imagination is the mind's image-making power, the power by which we produce ideal pictures of things. Reason is the measuring, comparing, and reflecting power, which either destroys those pictures, or reduces them to consistency with the external world, and so keeps the imagination in check. When the reflecting power is impaired by disease, and the imagination has free play, that condition of mind called madness is produced; and when the imagination is set at liberty by a suspension of the reflecting power in sleep, we are

said to dream. To believe in the imagination, and to be guided by it under the influence of ignorance and passion, is *Imaginism*; to distrust it, and follow the teaching of observation, reflection, and experience, is *Rationalism*; and there is no more important study for the statesman and the philosopher than the struggle which these two modes of thought are making in the world for supremacy, and the gradual yielding of the former to the latter." In short, the aim of Mr Vickers is to shew that all the religions of the world including the Jewish and the Christian, owe their origin to imagination; that they have no more a foundation in reality than the dreams that haunt us by night, or the fables which amused us in childhood; and as the terror inspired by the dream is dispelled by the light of day, and the stories of "Jack the Giant Killer," "Blue Beard," and "Red Riding Hood," which, when boys and girls, we most potently believed to be true, are rejected as mere legends when we come to the years of discretion, so all the supernatural narratives contained in the Old and New Testaments will be discarded as mankind advance from the childhood of imaginism to the manhood of rationalism. Painful as it is to record, and revolting as it must be to every Christian mind, to listen to the blasphemies of this school, it becomes our duty as journalists to mark the height to which the tide of infidelity has risen in our literature, were it only to shew the formidable extent to which it prevails in society where such a publication as the present can obtain a currency sufficient to induce a respectable firm to usher it into the world. The author seems to pride himself in the total want of reverence for all that men have deemed sacred and divine. He speaks of Moses as a political leader, who was by education a priest, and who judged that, instead of aspiring to the dangerous position of king, and becoming responsible for all that went wrong with them, he should rule them to greater advantage by setting up an all-powerful ideal king, *Jehovah*, and acting as his prophet or prime minister; and as to our blessed Lord, so far from acknowledging his divine excellence, Mr Vickers repudiates even the delineations of his character given by Strauss, Renan, and other rationalists, as fanciful exaggerations got up to conciliate the orthodox, and scoffingly represents him as an "ignorant weak-minded devotee." After this specimen of rationalistic ignorance, folly, and presumption, our readers may perhaps think we should have allowed the book to sink unnoticed into the oblivion which it deserves, and into which it is no doubt doomed to fall. But we think it worth noticing, as exhibiting the *Ultima Thule* of Rationalism—the last stage to which the speculations of our modern neologists would bring us. To this conclusion, even the writings of Mr John Stuart Mill are fast approaching, as sufficiently appears from an extract which Mr Vickers quotes with evident delight, and the contemptuous tone of which, in reference to the moral teachings of the gospel, betrays the same spirit of bitter animosity to the truth, the same incapacity to do justice to the lofty and peculiar claims of Christianity, and the same gross perversion, of literary and ecclesiastical history, to establish a preconceived theory as the book on which we are now commenting. But the night is never so dark as immediately before the dawn. If we may judge from the career of neology in Germany, the time of reaction cannot be far distant. The work before us seems to indicate this. Its unabashed, unblushing infidelity, dark and cold as an arctic night, without one redeeming quality to hide its odious form, or disguise its intentions, it may be regarded, we trust, as the harbinger of a better and a brighter day.

The Quakers, from their Origin till the Present Time: an International History. By JOHN CUNNINGHAM, D.D., Author of the Church History of Scotland, &c. Edinburgh: John Menzies & Co. 1868.

In this small volume Dr Cunningham has given a succinct, clear, and most readable narrative of Quakerism, ancient and modern, gathered with

great care from a variety of sources, and put together so as to form a lively and entertaining history. Hitherto, the public have been left to glean the history of the sect, either from controversial pieces, or from the partial representations of some fond disciple, in which the peculiarities of the Quakers are glossed over, or tenderly kept in the shade. In these pages we have the whole picture brought out. The eccentricities of Quakerism in its earlier developments, before it merged into the demure, pacific, money-making, and mildly charitable class now known by that name. Dr Cunningham is not only a candid critic, but a warm admirer of the sect. We only wish that, instead of treating us with a long history of slavery, he had dealt more closely, as a doctor of divinity, with the theological tenets of the sect; pointing out the leading errors into which they have fallen, and distinguishing between the radical fanaticism of the system, and the genuine spiritual religion of the New Testament.

A Memoir of Elizabeth Fry. By her Daughter, Mrs FRANCIS CRESSWELL. Abridged from the larger Memoir; with alterations and additions. London: James Nisbet & Co. 1868.

Those who wish to study Quakerism in its minuter lights and shades, and in the most amiable and attractive form in which it has ever appeared, would do well to procure this volume. Mrs Fry comes out before us in these revelations more as a Christian, in faith and in practice, than as the member of a sect. She resembles one of those good fairies in old tales of the nursery, who come to the help of the poor and the perishing in the guise of a kind stranger, and only discover themselves in their real character as "angels entertained unawares" by the light and the fragrance which they leave behind them. From every Christian sect some good may be learned; and in this world of sin and sorrow, the career of such a woman as Mrs Fry operates like the passage of a wholesome breeze through an atmosphere of foul and pestilential vapour.

The Questions of Jesus; or, The Great Physician Dealing with Souls. By Rev. ARTHUR THOMSON, Salton. Edinburgh: Andrew Elliot. 1867.

The two ideas which are carried out in this book commend themselves to us at once. In the first place, it was a good thought to collect and classify the many suggestive questions put in his day by our Lord; and, in the second place, it was a wise thing to arrange the brief expositions given of these questions, so as to furnish with them matter for family reading on every Sabbath of the year. It has often been remarked that an original mind is revealed as quickly in its questionings as in its replies; and, certainly, no one can run over in the most cursory way, even Mr Thomson's table of contents without feeling that, in proposing to deal with Christ's teaching on this side, he struck on a vein by which the explorer could not fail to be enriched. "What think ye of Christ?" "Whose Son is He?" "Who convinceth me of sin?" "Why dispute ye by the way?" "Wherefore didst thou doubt?" These are a sample of the questions which furnish matter for these Sabbath readings. The expositions themselves are short, plain, earnest, and practical. We miss, perhaps, something of the freshness, and life, and vivacity, which are so necessary in these days to arrest and stimulate the attention of languid readers; but the explanation is given in the first sentence of the preface. "The little book is one of the many fruits of affliction." Better than the sparkle of unsanctified wit, is the sobriety and thoughtfulness that come as the results of fatherly chastisement.

Memories of Olivet. By J. R. MACDUFF, D.D. London: James Nisbet & Co., 21 Berners Street. 1868.

This volume is uniform in purport and design with the author's two former works, "*Memories of Gennesaret*," and "*Memories of Bethany*"; the object of which is to bring together the miracles, the teachings, and other events or incidents in the life of the Saviour connected with these localities, and to expound the truths, and enforce the lessons, which they are intended to teach. The Mount of Olives is another spot around which gather the memories of many of the most wonderful and most solemn scenes in the history of our Lord. That mount was one of his most favourite places of resort. To its secluded retreat he often repaired alone, and often in company with his disciples, to engage in the exercises of secret or private devotion. Thither he and his disciples hastened after they had celebrated the first supper; and on their way, in the garden of Gethsemane, covered with the dark mantle of night, rendered still darker by the shadow of the olive trees which grew in that deep and gloomy valley, he drank the dregs of the cup of agony for the redemption of man. From the Mount of Olives he ascended into heaven, in the presence of his disciples, while in the act of blessing them. These and other scenes in the history of our Lord connected with that mount, Dr Macduff makes the subject of a series of interesting and instructive discourses. To carry out more fully the idea of his book, he has introduced some discourses *in memoriam* of Olivet, taken from the Old Testament Scriptures. He has thus turned to profitable account the associating and suggesting principle, which is not only helpful to memory, but which gives additional interest both to the object which suggests, and to what is suggested, the one lending attraction to the other.

This volume will sustain the reputation the author has acquired by his former works, which have given him a place among the most popular of our living authors on religious subjects. The sentiments are uniformly evangelical, and they are clothed in elegant, often ornamental, diction.

Pulpit Echoes; or, Passages from Discourses and Expositions. By the Rev. JOHN MACFARLANE, LL.D., London. London: James Nisbet & Co., Berners Street. 1868.

The passages of which this volume consists are a selection from the public discourses and expositions which the author delivered in Kincardine-on-Forth, in Glasgow, and in Clapham, London,—the three churches over which he has successively presided. They are mostly short-hand notes, which had been taken down *verbatim* by some of his hearers for their own improvement, and which he has corrected, and occasionally somewhat extended, to render them more intelligible, when now broken off from the matter with which they were at first connected. These notes are a repertory of many precious thoughts, often original, or so strikingly expressed as to come to the mind with the effect of novelty. They have even an advantage from having been taken down as they fell from the lips of the author in the ordinary course of pastoral instruction. Thoughts delivered without having been previously written, though not without premeditation, or such as spontaneously arise in the preacher's mind when excited with his theme at the time of delivery, have often a freshness and power which are lost when he subjects them in his closet to the process of elaborate polish. The subjects are of great variety; but the cross of Christ, it is manifest, as connected with the glory of God, the sinner's salvation and the Christian's privilege and duty, is the central point from which the author views the whole field of divine truth, and to which he

renders every topic and illustration introduced into the pulpit subordinate. To those who have enjoyed the ministry of the author, this volume will be valued as a pleasing souvenir of his labours ; but it is adapted for universal edification, and it will be read when lengthened published sermons would repel, or be left neglected.

When Shall These Things Be? or Signs of the Last Times. By the Rev. JOHN CUMMING, D.D. London : James Nisbet & Co., 21 Berners Street. 1868.

This work is a dissertation on the signs of our times, viewed as the fulfilment of those inspired productions which are admonitory of the speedy coming of Christ, that is to say, not of his coming, by the grace and power of his Spirit to convert the world, but of his coming personally—descending on Mount Olivet, and establishing his throne at Jerusalem. This is the theory of the book, and it is enunciated by the author, not as an opinion about the coming of Christ, for which he has a preference, or which he regards as highly probable, but as an article of faith, of which he has an undoubted assurance. Notwithstanding the confidence of the author, we have failed to discover in his pages any evidence on which our faith and reason can rest that Christ is to inaugurate the millennium by coming personally to the earth, or which in the slightest degree unsettles in our minds the conviction that he will not come personally to the earth till the last day, when he shall come to raise the dead and to judge the world. But though the accuracy of many of Dr Cumming's interpretations of prophecy may be contested, his work has true interest, and will be read with pleasure and profit. The author is a close observer of providence, in so far as it seems to throw light on the region of prophecy ; and in his discussions on the signs of our times there is much that is well and truly said.

Memoir of the Life of David Stow ; Founder of the Training System of Education. By the Rev. WILLIAM FRASER. London : James Nisbet & Co., 21 Berners Street. 1868.

David Stow, who was born on the 17th of May 1793, was the son of William Stow, a successful merchant in Paisley. When only eighteen years of age he became connected with a large commercial establishment in Glasgow, and at that early period of life he turned his youthful activities into the channel of philanthropic enterprise, for which Glasgow presented a wide and inviting field, from the social and moral degradation into which, from its rapidly increasing population, the masses were fast sinking. As a Sabbath-school teacher, he was eminently useful. He established two infant schools in Glasgow. He was the founder of the Normal Seminary in that city, which commenced its operations in 1837, the first institution of the kind in Britain. He died on the 6th of November 1864, in the 71st year of his age. This memoir is admirably written, and is of much practical value. It is well worthy of being carefully read, especially by Sabbath-school teachers and parents, who will find in Mr Stow's principles and method of training, much to direct and to render more effective and more pleasant their educational efforts. To young men we would recommend this biography, as affording a peculiarly valuable example of the importance of having the mind early imbued with Christian principles, and of the good which may be achieved by persistent activity in the ordinary walks of usefulness.

Light and Truth ; or, Bible Thoughts and Themes. By HORATIUS BONAR, D.D. London : James Nisbet & Co., 21 Berners Street. 1868.

This volume is the production of an author already well known in the religious world, and it will, we doubt not, be welcomed by numerous readers. It is "an attempt to bring out, as briefly as possible, the thoughts of God as contained in the words of his book." The author limits himself to the Old Testament, intending, we presume, to prepare another volume similar in plan, on the New Testament. The subjects are happily chosen, and as each extends only to about four pages, are numerous and varied. They are treated intentionally with much simplicity and brevity, but, at the same time, in a very engaging and attractive manner. The volume is wholly devoid of the sensational, the mystical, and the sentimental ; but it is replete with light and truth, which are the great things we want in reading and studying the Word of God. It is eminently suggestive ; and to those who have little leisure we would recommend the reading of one of these Bible expositions daily, which would occupy only a few minutes, and which, by affording themes for profitable reflection, would serve to enlighten, guide, comfort, and purify the mind, and to increase its love and veneration for the divine word.

The World a School for Christ's People. A Sermon preached before the Free Synod of Lothian and Tweeddale. By the Rev. WILLIAM WHITE, Haddington. Published at the request of the Synod. Edinburgh : Duncan Grant, Bank Street. 1867.

Though it is not our usual way to notice single sermons, we must make an exception in favour of this discourse, which is itself rather out of the usual way of sermons. It is clearly the production of a mind which not only thinks for itself, but thinks out its subject deeply and thoroughly in an independent and original manner. The effect is as if a new vein had been opened up in the golden mine of Scripture. Not that any new truth has been discovered, for we recognise it when declared as the plain teaching of revelation, but we feel as if it had been set forth for the first time before us, in its proper force and effect. The text is taken from John xvii. 15, "I pray not that thou shouldest take them out of the world." From this, the preacher descants upon the world as a training school for Christ's people. This view he illustrates from the history of the Apostles, and applies to Christians in general as scholars and students. We can only regret that time did not permit him to apply it more particularly to the teachers of Christianity, before whom the discourse was delivered. But, that its practical value was felt by them sufficiently appears, by its having been published at their request.

The Christian Year Book for 1868. London : Jackson, Walford, & Hodder.

Here we have a bird's eye view of the whole world called Christian—its sects, its statistics, and its operations. The whole net-work, in short, of Christian evangelisation spread over the surface of the globe. The vast amount and variety of information herein condensed, must prove as useful as it will be interesting to every Christian reader.

Memorials of the Rev. Andrew Crichton, B.A., of Edinburgh and Dundee.
 Edited by WILLIAM G. BLAIKIE, D.D. London : James Nisbet & Co.,
 21 Berners Street. 1868.

At a time when the literary market is somewhat overstocked with memorials of this kind, it is no small praise to say, that we have perused this volume with lively and unabated interest. Few of our younger pastors gave richer promise of future usefulness and popularity than Andrew Crichton. In these memorials of his brief earthly career, Dr Blaikie has done ample justice to his subject. Avoiding all needless dilation and digression, he has touched in with a masterly hand the leading traits of Mr Crichton's character, producing a likeness which all who knew that lamented youth must appreciate as genuine, and, at the same time, a model of devoted energy, catholic zeal, and amiable piety, which all aspirants to the ministry would do well to study. In perusing Mr Crichton's discourses given in this volume, nothing has struck us so forcibly as the evidences which they bear of his strong poetic temperament. One or two specimens of his poetry here given are truly beautiful ; but we refer now to the style of his sermons. To say that his style is elegant, is to say nothing more than what may be asserted of hundreds of similar productions of the present day. It may more truly be described as lyrical. Some of these sermons are pervaded by the terse and telling utterances of the genuine poet, and with a few slight modifications, would read like blank verse. We might refer particularly to Sermon Tenth, on "Falling Asleep." How sadly perplexing would be the early removal of such a promising youth from the Church below, "if thou wert all and nought beyond, O earth."

Lectures on the Epistle of Paul to the Ephesians, Chapter I., Expository and Practical. By the Rev. WILLIAM ALVES, A.M. St Johns, New Brunswick : J. & A. M'Millan. 1867.

This is a volume of fourteen discourses, delivered in the ordinary course of his pulpit ministrations, by a colonial minister to a colonial congregation. We heartily welcome its appearance, as a contribution to sacred literature of substantial value. It is a fact worthy of notice that Ritualism, in these days so ripe in the mother country, has, with a few and rare exceptions, never troubled the colonial churches. This modern departure from the simplicity of the Gospel is of home origin, of home culture, the offspring of certain religious conditions which, as a general rule, the British dependencies do not as yet supply. Colonial life is earnest, either for good or evil. It may accept or refuse the reality, but will not readily submit to an unsubstantial compromise of forms, however imposing, if empty. Ministers soon come to know this ; and earnest men fall back with more confiding reliance in the solid and simple doctrines of the Cross, as the best and only means of strength to themselves, and of food to the souls of those who hear them.

Of the truth of this, the volume before us is an excellent specimen, both in the choice of the subject-matter, and the way in which it is handled. The Epistle to the Ephesians, written at Rome, perhaps under the shadow of Caesar's Palace, by "Paul, the prisoner of the Lord," and within two years of his martyrdom, is one of the richest treasures of Sacred truth. "It surpasses," says Grotius, "all human eloquence—describing the sublimity of the things by corresponding words, more sublime than are elsewhere found in human language." Mr Alves has treated his subject, not as a polemic, but as a pastor—a pastor of varied gifts and no

mean scholarship. The grand fundamental truths contained are set forth with great clearness, in a style as trenchant as elegant—not as a barren theory, but with pointed and often powerful practical application to the heart and conscience. On minute points of interpretation, there may be room for difference of opinion, as there are differences between the most eminent critics, such as Hodge, Eadie, Alford, and Ellicott; while all coincide in their views of the most important doctrines in this remarkable portion of Scripture. With such names as the above, we do not hesitate to associate that of Mr Alves.

Devout Thoughts by Deep Thinkers; selected and arranged from 'The Portfolio' of "The Record." By SUSAN COALBANK, Old Dalby, Leicestershire. With a Preface by the Rev. J. C. RYLE, Vicar of Stradbroke, Suffolk, Vol. I. London: James Nisbet & Co., 21 Berners Street. 1867.

The extracts of which this work consists, are selections from the works of the most eminent theological writers, who have flourished from the earliest ages of Christianity down to the present day, but chiefly from the writings of theologians of the Church of England and of the English Puritans. They have now the advantage of appearing, not, as at first, in an isolated form in a corner of the "Record" newspaper, but collected and arranged under various heads, which embrace almost every fundamental principle relating to Christian doctrine and practice. The intelligence and good taste with which they are selected and methodised, reflect much credit on the excellent authoress. This treasury will supply a manual which many may have felt to be a desideratum. To provide the means of obtaining at a glance some of the most precious and profound thoughts of several hundreds of the ablest and most devoted students, who had drunk deep at the sacred fount, on the most essential points bearing on our faith, and hope, and deportment, is to render an important service to the Christian Church. Few are in possession of the numerous volumes from which these selections are made, and few have leisure to read such a ponderous mass of theological literature. Such as have not dipped into the authors here quoted, especially those of the Reformation and Puritan periods, must be struck with the vigour, freshness, originality, and power displayed in their writings.

Springdale Abbey. Extracts from the Diaries and Letters of an English Preacher. London: Longmans, Green, & Co. 1868.

The author of this volume, who is some snug incumbent of the English Church, talks here *de omnibus rebus et quibusdam aliis*, in a free and frisky style, which he plainly mistakes for wit and pleasantry. The whole is pervaded by a strong odour of egotism, which would be amusing were it not so monstrous. *My house, my garden, my bath, my everything*, down to the brushing of *my hat*, are described with such extravagant minuteness, that we inclined, for some pages, to the belief that the writer meant a sly satire on the style of our popular novels. On subsequent perusal, we became satisfied that no such imitation of Gulliver was intended. He is sincere in his egotism, and honestly bent on a tour in search of the picturesque. Such sad trifling in a clergyman, at a time when the Church to which he belongs is involved in a sea of troubles, attracting crowds of anxious observers to the shore to witness its impending crisis, reminds one of Nero fiddling when Rome was in flames.

We earnestly trust that such *incumbents* are rare exceptions at such a juncture, when the enemy is at the gates, and when all good men and true are either upon their feet, in mortal combat, or—upon their knees!

The following works have come to hand too late to be noticed in this number:—"History of Israel to the Death of Moses," by Oswald; "Parting Counsels," by Rev. John Allen; "Thoughts on Reading the Bible," by Homo; "Life of Pastor Fleidner;" "Coming Events and Present Duties," by the Rev. J. C. Ryle; "The Work of God in Every Age," by the Rev. W. Frogget; "Short Family Readings for Sundays;" "Pastoral Counsels," by the late Dr Robertson of Glasgow; "The Holy Child, and other Poems," by Stephen Jenner; "Joel, a Translation in Metrical Parallelism," by Adam Clarke Rowley; "Truths for the Times," &c., &c.

Owing to the extreme length of some of the Communications in the present Number, we have been reluctantly compelled to delay the insertion of several Articles and Notices till next Number.

BRITISH AND FOREIGN EVANGELICAL REVIEW.

JULY 1868.

ART. I.—*Montalembert on St Columba.*

The Monks of the West, from St Benedict to St Bernard. By the Count DE MONTALEMBERT, Member of the French Academy. Vols. i.—v. Edinburgh. 1861–7.

BEFORE the eyes of Europe the Count de Montalembert occupies a position peculiarly his own. He is known as a French gentleman, who cherishes ardent sympathies with political liberty and progress, and who accepts without reserve, and without regret, that social condition produced by the French Revolution, “which under the name of democracy reigns, and,” as he thinks, “will reign more and more in the modern world”: while, at the same time, he avows and proclaims the infallible authority of that church, which, through its head and representative, Pius IX., denounces the political progress of the age as essentially anarchical, revolutionary, infidel, and as opposed to all its dearest interests and projects. The position is indeed peculiar. A single individual may have dexterity enough to balance himself upon that dizzy ridge for a time, but the multitude could not keep their footing upon it for a moment; they must slide down upon the one side or the other, and find themselves landed in the end, either among the friends of civil freedom or the partisans of religious despotism. To serve two masters who issue contradictory orders, and to please them both, is no easy task; yet it does not seem much more difficult than for a man to fuse down into consistency in his intellectual creed the two opposing principles represented by Garibaldi and the Pope.

In his great work entitled *The Monks of the West*, and of which five volumes, in the authorised English translation, are now before us, the Count claims a hearing from the present generation on the subject of monasticism. He is especially enamoured of that department of the church system with which he is connected, and his book is avowedly written to vindicate the glory of what he calls "one of the greatest institutions of Christianity." From an age which claims to be more dispassionate and unprejudiced than any which has gone before it, he asks to be heard, while he reminds it of the services which these much despised monks have rendered to the cause of truth and freedom, and shews what Christianity and the world have lost by the overthrow of a system, upon which, always first, the spoiler, whether despot or demagogue, is sure to lay a heavy hand, the first moment he can do it safely. The request is reasonable enough. An able man who has something to say upon an important subject, which has given direction to the thoughts and studies of a large portion of his life, is entitled to be heard with respectful attention, however difficult we find it to sympathise in his feelings or to agree with the conclusions at which he has arrived.

When we survey the monasticism which existed in the church from the fourth century till the Reformation, we freely admit, that, in the circumstances in which the world then found itself placed, it was far from being an unmitigated evil. In its origin, at least, it was a great human effort to remedy the moral disorder by which mankind in all ages are infected. When children raise a ladder upon the hill-top, with the design that upon it they may climb upwards, and thus draw nearer to God, we cannot make light of their motives even though we should smile at their plans; and so, every attempt of man to eradicate the selfishness of his nature, to turn back the tide of the world's corruption, and to elevate himself in the scale of morality, is so far praiseworthy, even though we have no faith that this is to be done by men and women entering voluntarily into a prison, shutting themselves up, and barring the world out. In the darkest of the ages, souls truly pious, there can be no doubt, often withdrew to such places that they might without distraction prepare for another world. In times of lawless force and bloodshed, every one knows that the monastery was an asylum, where weak and timorous spirits, ill able to cope with the rude society in which they found themselves, could retire for shelter and safety. The old monks in their earliest and best days, before their indolence was fostered by wealth and luxury, were often the only examples of peaceful industry in a district, and taught their less skilful neighbours how to till the earth, and draw from the reluctant soil a more generous

return for their labour. In their lonely cells they often spent their leisure in copying valuable manuscripts, and producing original works, which, though seldom rising to the rank of classics, have preserved many valuable facts, and are true photographs of the bright and the dark, the comely and ungainly features of their times. Perhaps it is not too much to say, that under the deluge of barbarism that overflowed the civilisation of Christendom in the early mediæval ages, the Scriptures and the classics must have perished had it not been that they were deposited in those monastic edifices, for which the wildest pagans, in many instances, entertained a superstitious respect. Moreover, in cases without number, the monastery was a missionary training school, planted within the limits of some heathen land, from which the monks went forth courageously and devotedly to propagate the religion of the age, such as it was, in the surrounding districts—to be the pioneers of civilisation and the advance-guard of Christianity among a rude and idolatrous population. In old feudal times, when the strong were so ready to domineer over the weak, and society had so little thought of providing for the unfortunate, in the monastery, spirits bruised and bleeding found advice, the sick found medicine, the hungry poor found bread, and the benighted and storm-stayed traveller, entertainment and rest. It would be uncandid not to admit, with very little exception indeed, the statement of the Count, that the monasteries “were for ten centuries and more, the schools, the archives, the libraries, the hostelries, the studios, the penitentiaries, and the hospitals of Christian society.”*

But while acknowledging the great services which the monks have rendered to the world in the mediæval period, there is another view of the case to which we cannot close our eyes. Monasticism, instead of being “one of the greatest institutions of Christianity,” has no claim whatever to be divine in its origin; Christ and his apostles were not monks, neither did they enjoin upon their followers to renounce the society of their kind, and immure themselves in the solitude of the cloister. On the contrary, the leaven was to be put into the meal; the true religion was to come into contact with humanity and strive to gain, to direct, to improve it. Asceticism is a mere human attempt to perform upon human nature a work, which the gospel has made ample provision for performing in a much more effective way. Grant that the cloister has often sheltered the helpless and unfortunate; it has often sheltered, too, the ignorant, the superstitious, the criminal, the polluted, the despot, and the knave. Brigands have been known to use

* “*Monks of the West*,” vol. i., p. 107.

abbeys as the storehouse of their plunder; and kings have used their rich revenues for pensioning their mistresses, supporting their bastards, and rewarding the most unscrupulous of their tools. The education received in the cloisters was essentially of a narrow kind, dwarfing the intellect and robbing it of that expansiveness and freedom essential to high culture and to real progress. If they opened their door to the feeble and innocent in days of oppression and danger, it cannot be pretended that there is the same need for them now, when law and order are established, when society provides ample means for alleviating every want and woe that it is possible to relieve, when the printing press has given a perpetuity to literature which neither Goth nor Vandal can destroy, and when the claims of the poor and the defenceless meet with favourable consideration from every government in Christendom. Monasticism seems even to have lost its power of propagating Christianity in any type; there is no instance since the Reformation of any pagan nation being Christianised by monks. For all these reasons we do not feel justified in dissenting from the general opinion, which is, that however serviceable the monastery may have been as an institution in the mediæval ages, preserving, as in an ark, the treasures of religion and learning from the waves of barbarism, which in rapid succession broke over Europe, it has lost to a great extent its beneficial power, and in the present state of society has no peculiar functions of a useful nature to discharge; and that the truly good of both sexes would better serve the end of their being by mixing in society, and trying to improve it, than by turning monks and nuns, and looking out on the world from behind the bars of the prison, within which they have with their own consent submitted to be encaged.

These views are not by any means peculiar to Protestants; they are steadily making way among Roman Catholics themselves, among whom monasticism is not in such repute as it once was. In all countries which three centuries ago declared for Protestantism in any of its forms, the Reformation gave a deadly blow to the system; the growth of modern civilisation is silently and surely completing its overthrow in the Catholic nations at the present hour. To some of our readers, the information given by the Count in the introduction to his work will probably be new. The work of spoliation, he states, which commenced at the Reformation, is "proceeding with methodical gravity." In the five years from 1830 till 1835, no less than "three thousand monasteries have disappeared from the soil of Europe." In Portugal alone three hundred were destroyed, two hundred in Poland, and the number annihilated by Queen Christina in Spain has not been estimated.

But in no country has the ruin been so complete as in France. The great monastery at Clairvaux, which once held St Bernard and his five hundred monks, is now a prison with five hundred convicts in it. The celebrated abbey of Clugny, which figures so largely in the history of the middle ages, has been turned into stud-stables, and in 1844 the place of the high altar was "the starting post of the stallions." The abbey of Le Bec in Normandy, from which Lanfranc and Anselm came forth successively to fill the see of Canterbury, has been utilised in the same fashion, and horses fatten where monks once fasted and prayed. A china manufactory is carried on in the Char-treux of Seville, and swine have taken possession of the cells in the Cistercian Abbey of Cadouin. Everywhere, as the Count informs us, the work of ruin proceeds. "Sometimes," says he, "the spinning mill is installed under the roof of the ancient sanctuary. Instead of echoing night and day the praises of God, these dishonoured arches too often repeat only blasphemies and obscene cries, mingling with the shrill voice of the machinery, the grinding of the saw, or the monotonous clank of the piston." Nor is this all. John Knox has been sometimes stigmatised as a barbarian for the encouragement which he is said to have given the populace in demolishing Christian edifices where the relics of idolatry were enshrined; but even where the excited rabble did their worst, the ivied ruin still remains to tell of a grandeur which has passed away, and to mark, for the present and other generations, the spot where their fathers prayed. But in France, it appears, the work of demolition is done much more scientifically and thoroughly. They are not content *there* with confiscation, plunder, profanation; they overthrow, raze from the foundation, leave not a single stone standing on another. "The empire of the east," says the Count, "has not been ravaged by the Turks as France has been, and still is by that band of insatiable destroyers, who, after having purchased these vast constructions and immense domains at the lowest rate, work them like quarries for sacrilegious profit. I have seen with my own eyes the capitals and columns of an abbey church which I could name, *employed as so much metal for the neighbouring road.*" And again, "What remains of so many palaces raised in silence and solitude for the products of art, for the progress and pleasure of the mind, for disinterested labour? Masses of broken wall inhabited by owls and rats, shapeless remains, heaps of stones, and pools of water. Everywhere *desolation, filth, and disorder.*"*

* "Monks of the West," Introduction, ch. viii.

It is in these circumstances that Montalembert sat down to write his *Monks of the West*, and has devoted to the task the labour of twenty years. However mistaken we may think this gifted son and servant of the Church of Rome, as to the importance of the object to which he has consecrated so large a portion of his life, it is impossible to withhold our admiration, either from the earnestness of spirit which prompted him to make the sacrifice, or from the fine conception or vigorous execution displayed in his attempt to teach the world what it owes to the monks, what it has gained by their existence, what it has lost by their overthrow. Nothing which could be fairly said in favour of monasticism, does he leave unsaid ; while much that might be truthfully alleged against it, he has either attempted to parry, or produced the impression that it is too insignificant to make any demand upon his attention or his time. No cause could desire the services of an abler or more eloquent advocate ; not only has he given prominence to the strong points of the case, but invested the subject with interest, and shed around it no small share of that lustre which genius has at its command. He would disclaim—indeed, he does expressly disclaim—the work of the panegyrist ; he even admits and deplores the errors, and follies, and abuses that the system has developed in the course of ages ; but this is simply a set-off, a small speck, serving to do little more than intensify the brilliance of a eulogy which shines out strongly from the beginning to the end. He professes to “conceal no stain, that he may have the fuller right of veiling no glory.” His work, therefore, has all the effect of a panegyric. Everywhere he seeks to give his readers the impression upon his own mind, that since Christianity was preached to the world by the apostles, there have lived no men to whom society owes so much as to the monks, and that courage and manhood, as well as purity of faith, found among them their highest and noblest types. He states further, that during a twenty years’ study of their acts and writings, he hardly ever found among them “either an egotist or a liar, an ungrateful or servile soul” : he is convinced “that there has never been in any society, or at any epoch, men more energetic, more active, or more practical than the monks of the middle ages” ; and the monastery he regards as the school of true dignity and freedom—the “permanent nursery of great souls.”* Disclaim it as he may, his work is a eulogy, rather than a history, and never more so than when he whispers the faults of the monks in order that he may gain the more implicit credence when he sounds their praise. It is more than a panegyric—it is an elegy. The

* “*Monks of the West*,” Introduction, ch iii.

author speaks as one who stands over the coffin of his subject, and lovingly recounts all the good deeds of the departed in the burning words of poetry and passion.

In a work which has occupied the thoughts of its author for such a period of years, intended evidently to be the masterpiece by which he would be known to after times, travelling with the monks over every nation of western Europe, ranging in the extensiveness of its sweep from Benedict to Bernard, and drawing its material from hundreds of volumes, it would be impossible, in the narrow limits accorded to a review, to follow to every place whither the writer chooses to lead. But the merits of the work can be tested in a way equally satisfactory. Choosing one of the sections into which this voluminous treatise is marked off, and confining ourselves scrupulously to it, we can submit it to careful examination, and in proportion as we find it trustworthy and accurate, we shall be able to infer similar qualities in the unexamined portions of the work. This would not be an unfair test, even if the section chosen was the most open to exception, for the strength of the chain is its strength at the weakest point ; but when we select Book ix. for examination, we do so, not that we have any reason to think it weaker than any other portion of the history, but because that in it is told the story of St Columba, the Apostle of Caledonia ; and dealing as it does with the affairs of our own country, may therefore be counted of more interest to our readers.

Columba (521–597 A.D.) was a monk, nearly connected with some of the reigning families in the north of Ireland, who passed over to North Britain, and founded a monastery in the island of Iona in the year 563. He ruled with undisputed sway as abbot over the little community which he gathered round him upon the island, exercised considerable political influence over the petty kings and kingdoms which were at the time thickly planted both in Ireland and Caledonia, and succeeded in converting the northern Picts, who then occupied the Scottish Highlands, from paganism to Christianity.

Iona was the seat of Columba's greatest monastery, and the head-quarters of the Pictish mission. It forms one of the Hebrides or Western Islands, which are thus described by the Count, in a passage whose graphic power and beauty cannot fail to impress the reader :—

“ He who has not seen the islands and gulfs of the western coast of Scotland, and who has not been tossed upon the sombre sea of the Hebrides, can scarcely form any image of it to himself. Nothing can be less seductive at the first glance than that austere and solemn nature, which is picturesque without charm, and grand without grace. The traveller passes sadly through an archipelago of naked and desert islands, sowed, like so many extinct volcanoes, upon the dull and

sullen waters, which are broken by rapid currents and dangerous whirlpools. Except on rare days, when the sun—that pale sun of the north—gives life to these shores, the eye wanders over a vast surface of gloomy sea, broken at intervals by the whitening crest of waves, or by the foamy line of the tide which dashes here against long reefs of rock, there against the immense cliffs, with a forlorn roar which fills the air. Through the continual fogs and rains of that rude climate may be seen by times the summits of chains of mountains, whose abrupt and naked sides slope to the sea, and whose base is bathed by those cold waves which are kept in constant agitation by the shock of contrary currents, and the tempests of wind which burst from the lakes and narrow ravines further inland. The melancholy of the landscape is relieved only by that peculiar configuration of the coast, which has been remarked by the ancient authors, and especially by Tacitus—a configuration which exists besides only in Greece and Scandinavia. As in the fiords of Norway, the sea cuts and hollows out the shores of the islands into a host of bays and gulfs, of strange depth, and as narrow as profound. These gulfs take the most varied forms, penetrating by a thousand tortuous folds into the middle of the land, as if to identify themselves with the long and winding lakes of the highland interior. Numberless peninsulas, terminating in pointed headlands, or summits covered with clouds; isthmuses so narrow as to leave the sea visible at both sides; straits so closely shut between two walls of rock, that the eye hesitates to plunge into that gloom; enormous cliffs of basalt or of granite, their sides perforated with rents; caverns as at Staffa, lofty as churches, flanked through all their length by prismatic columns, through which the waves of the ocean dash with groans; and here and there, in contrast with that wild majesty, perhaps on an island, perhaps upon the shore of the mainland, a sandy beach, a little plain, covered with scanty prickly grass; a natural port, capable of sheltering a few frail boats; everywhere, in short, a strangely varied combination of land and sea, but where the sea carries the day, penetrates and dominates everything. . . . Such is the present aspect—such must have been, with the addition of the forests which have disappeared, the aspect of those shores when Columba sought them to continue and end his life there.” —*Monks of the West*, book ix. ch. ii.

There seems to be a species of cruelty in submitting to the cold test of historical criticism, a glowing narrative, so beautifully introduced, and so well sustained to the close; but in the interests of the public, unpleasant things must occasionally be done. We begin by reminding our readers that all historical evidence is valuable, other things being equal, exactly in proportion as it is contemporary. An event which finds no written record within a hundred or a hundred and fifty years after its occurrence, must be very striking and important indeed, if it is transmitted orally for any considerable time after without suffering distortion; and it is within the experience of every one, how the details, even of an important event, when not

perpetuated by writing, perhaps in less than a hundred years, drop out of men's memory, and fall into oblivion. Few public events in our time are left without a written record of their occurrence ; but let any man look back to some important event that occurred in the middle of the last century within his own family, and see how much of it he knows by oral tradition alone. If very important, he has probably heard of it, but if no written record of it is transmitted, he only sees it through a haze, while mere details and circumstances have entirely disappeared. It could not have been different in ages of barbarism and ignorance ; oral tradition, then, to say the least, was as unsatisfactory and as untrustworthy as now. It follows from this, that the historian who stands nearest to the event which he describes, other things being equal, has the best opportunities for knowing the truth, and when he uses these opportunities faithfully, is deserving of the most credit. If the writer was an eye-witness, tradition does not come in to distort the story ; if he received the fact from an eye-witness, or from one who heard from an eye-witness, that is the most trustworthy form of tradition, inasmuch as in such a case the story passes through fewer hands. Every historian now knows the value of contemporary evidence. Even the Count himself recognises the importance of it, when we find him giving the assurance—"I have sought to represent the monastic orders, and the society in which they occupied so important a place, by reproducing faithfully the features and the colours *furnished by contemporary authors.*"

To act strictly on this principle with regard to St Columba, would make short work with him indeed. No work composed by himself is now extant ; the poems usually ascribed to him, are not yet proved to be genuine, and some of them certainly bear upon their face the marks of a later age. The *Amhra*, ascribed to Dallan Forgaill the chief of the Irish bards, would be a contemporary account, if only its genuineness were an established fact ; not only is this not the case, but it also carries with it manifest symptoms of the legendary. The fact is that no account of the Abbot of Iona, written either by himself or any of his contemporaries, is now in existence ; and as a consequence in his case, we are left entirely destitute of historical evidence in the highest degree.

But evidence in the second degree is forthcoming in regard to him. The oldest of his biographers is Cummen Finn, who was Abbot of Iona from 657 to 669, who possibly may have seen the Saint when he himself was a child, and who certainly was the friend and associate of those who did. Another of his biographers was Adamnan, who was Abbot of Iona from 679 till 704, and who composed an account of the Saint within one

hundred years after his death. Lastly, we have the short notice of him, given by the Venerable Bede in his *Ecclesiastical History*, which was compiled between 715 and 735. This account, written about one hundred and twenty years after Columba's death, is specially valuable, notwithstanding the disadvantages as to time and place under which the author laboured, because it entirely discards the miraculous, and limits itself to the strictly historical. Any work now treating of the founder of Iona, and based upon the original sources, must of necessity derive *all* its material from Cummen, Adamnan, or Bede. No other authority in fact exists, which even pretends to be a contemporary document, or in whose behalf such a claim has been put forward, save and except the *Poems* and the *Amhra*, whose genuineness has been questioned, and has never yet been proved. Of these original authorities, Adamnan, though not the oldest, is the most complete, for he has absorbed Cummen's work entirely, and actually made it a portion of his own narrative, while the additional facts recorded in Bede are few in number, and there is some reason to believe that all Bede's information on the subject was obtained by indirect communication with him. Any work on Columba, based upon the original authorities, must therefore of necessity rest mainly on Adamnan's *Vita Sancti Columbæ*.

This being the state of the case, the Count de Montalembert's readers are surprised to find from his notes, that one of the main sources from which he derives what he knows of Columba, is—not Adamnan, but O'Donnel. He quotes the latter by name no less than thirty-five times, giving copious extracts in the notes to justify the statements made in the text, and he allows material provided by O'Donnel to colour the picture in many instances where his name is not mentioned. Who was this O'Donnel, the reader naturally inquires, on whom so large a portion of the story of Columba is avowedly made to rest? He was not "the grand-nephew" of the Saint, as the Count strangely asserts,* but one who claimed relationship with him, and lived a thousand years after him. The Count himself, inconsistently enough, supplies the true state of the case in another part of his book.† In the year 1532, Manus O'Donnel, Prince of Tyrconnel, a scion of one of the old royal races that bore sway in Ireland before it became thoroughly subject to the English, wrote at Lifford, in the county Donegal, a Life of St Columba. Taking Adamnan, and an old Irish Life of the tenth century, still in existence, as his basis, and using as material the spurious poems and other well-known legendary matter, and adding thereto

* "Monks of the West," book ix. ch. vi. p. 244.

† Ibid. book ix. ch. i. p. 100.

the fireside stories told of the Saint, and current in the Donegal highlands in the sixteenth century, he constructed a biography, expressed in elegant Irish, and ranged in chronological order. The enthusiasm which the old chieftain of Tyrconnel felt for his subject was natural enough, his object being to proclaim the praise of the celebrated Abbot who, though dead a thousand years before, was still a member of the fine old Irish family to which he himself belonged, and to inform posterity that a race, which, as every one knows, was prolific in soldiers, was not altogether sterile in saints. Yet the character given to the work by the best judges is, that it is a mass of silly fables and legends, which were sedulously collected by a man of no critical acumen, and of a credulity so capacious as almost to exceed belief, while the matter that it contains additional to Adamnan, is of no historical value whatsoever. It was never printed, but the original manuscript in Irish is preserved entire, and may be seen at this day in the Bodleian Library at Oxford : but when John Colgan, an Irish Franciscan, issued his *Trias Thaumaturga* at Louvain, in 1647, he selected those parts of O'Donnel's work, which he considered least fabulous and foolish, and translated them from Irish into Latin, and inserted them in his work as the *Fifth Life* of St Columba. The most foolish parts of O'Donnel's book, Colgan exercised a wise discretion in leaving untranslated ; but even with regard to that portion which he presented to his readers in a Latin dress, Dr Lanigan, a learned and respectable Roman Catholic writer, says that some of it is so "nonsensical and evidently fabulous, that it is surprising how Colgan could have published *such stuff*."*

Now, this is the very stuff that the Count de Montalembert uses to such a large extent in constructing his Memoir of Columba. It is this writer of the *sixteenth* century, whom he uses as one of his main sources, for the life of a man who lived and died within the *sixth* century—as if a thousand years' distance in time was a mere trifle, not worthy to be taken into account, in the matter of historical evidence. A considerable portion of his narrative is made to rest on O'Donnel alone. Cummen, Adamnan, and Bede, say nothing of the following incidents : the Vision of the Three Sisters, the Quarrel with St Kieran, the devotion of Mochonna son of the king of Ulster, the story of the monk who yielded to temptation, the trial of the saint's own chastity, his speech at the Convention of Drumceatt, the story of King Aedh and the abbot's cowl, the promise made to the Leinster men at Durrow, and the "dangerous macerations" which Columba, we are told, inflicted on himself. For none of these incidents is any authority

* Lanigan's "Ecc. Hist. of Ireland," ch. xi. note 71.

alleged except that of O'Donnel, supported in one instance by Dr Lynch, author of *Cambrensis Eversus*, a writer of the seventeenth century ; and yet the Count adopts all of them on that authority, and weaves them into his narrative. This fact seriously impairs the credit which otherwise would be due to the profession made by the Count in the introduction to his work : "*Every word* which I have written has been drawn from *original* and *contemporary* sources."* Colgan's Latin abridgment is not an original, nor is Manus O'Donnel of the sixteenth century a contemporary of a saint who lived in the sixth.

But this is not all. In instances not a few, where the original authorities are ignored or contradicted by O'Donnel, the Count adopts the statement of the modern, in preference to those of the ancient, writer. Various instances of this may be specified. Thus Adamnan, speaking of the excommunication of Columba at the Synod of Teltoun, states that it was done, "not righteously," but was owing to certain "venial and quite excusable reasons, as afterwards in the end was made clear."† This statement is vague enough, but it is not likely that Adamnan would have spoken of it in this way had Columba been guilty of any public and notorious sin. But O'Donnel, at the end of a thousand years, does not hesitate to clear up a matter which Adamnan left enveloped in mystery ; for, by his account, the offence for which Columba was excommunicated by the Synod was his being the author, or at least the occasion, of the death of all who fell in the battle of Cooldrevny. The Count adopts this unhistorical representation of the Prince of Tyrconnel in opposition to Adamnan, as if the latter supposed that the "shedding of Christian blood" was a venial thing, or as if the saint's share in a transaction so notorious could ever have been cleared up by farther evidence.‡ Though the sentence of excommunication was withdrawn, O'Donnel and other legendary writers represent him as going into voluntary exile, in consequence of remorse of conscience for taking part in various battles, and of the sentence pronounced upon him by his confessor, St Molash of Devenish, who condemned him to banishment from Ireland till he would save as many souls by his preaching as he had destroyed lives by his quarrels. Nothing of all this appears in the original authorities. Adamnan never even alludes to St Molash, but expressly states that Columba of his own will went

* "Monks of the West," Introduction, ch. x., vol. i. p. 235.

† Pro quibusdam veniabilibus et tam excusabilibus causis, non recte, ut post in fine clariut.—Adamnan, De Vita S. Col. iii. 3.

‡ "Monks of the West," book ix., ch. i. p. 127.

abroad for Christ's sake.* For no apparent object, except to exhibit in deeper colour the contrast between his early and his monastic life, the Count adopts the statement of the legendary writers, that he went abroad to do penance for political crimes; and in face of the fact recorded by Adamnan, that he revisited Ireland again and again,† the Count records the sentence of perpetual exile as if it were veritable history. Certainly it seems a strange notion for a criminal, himself under penitential discipline for his crimes, to set out to a foreign shore in order to convert pagans to Christianity, to take twelve companions with him who recognise him as their spiritual father, to instruct them in religion, to impose penances upon some, to grant absolution to others, and on behalf of all to serve at the altar, at the very time when, to use the words of our author, he was dedicating "the rest of his life to the expiation of his faults."‡

The moral condition of the apostle of Caledonia, when setting forth on his mission, required of course to undergo a great change if any success was to result. The representation given by the Count implies the necessity of this; otherwise we would have a man of fiery and unchastened spirit presiding over a religious community, and preaching the Word of God to pagan tribes—an incongruity which all must observe. Of course he passes through a change:—

"As soon as he had installed himself with his companions in that desert isle, from whence the Christian faith and monastic life were about to radiate over the north of Great Britain, a gradual and almost complete transformation became apparent in him. Without giving up the lovable peculiarities of his character and race, he gradually became a model for penitents, and at the same time for confessors and preachers. . . . This man, whom we have seen so passionate, so irritable, so warlike and vindictive, became, little by little, the most gentle, the humblest, the most tender of friends and fathers. It was he, the great head of the Caledonian Church, who, kneeling before the strangers who came to Iona, or before the monks returning from their work, took off their shoes, washed their feet, and, after having washed them, respectfully kissed them."—*Monks of the West*, book ix. ch. iii.

This is a pleasant picture; but the best of it is, that in none of the ancient biographers is there the slightest trace of any such change. Adamnan, the main authority, gives no hint of it: not only so, but he implies the very reverse. Columba with him is a saint from the cradle. Even at the Synod,

* De Scotia ad Britanniam pro Christo peregrinari volens, enavigavit.—Ad. 2, pref.

† Ad. i. 3, 10, 88, 40, 42, 50; ii. 19, 86, 41, 43.

‡ Book ix., ch. i. p. 133.

where he was excommunicated, Brendan of Birr is represented as stating that he saw an angel in his company marching over the plain. He leaves his country out of love for Christ and human souls. No marked change in his character after coming to Iona is ever hinted at, and he is never described on any occasion as washing and kissing the feet of his monks. The Count, in making these statements at variance with all the original sources, has allowed himself to be led astray by the uncritical and mythical representations of O'Donnel, which seem to have seized upon his imagination and carried it away. When in another connection he quotes the life of St Farannan, written in the thirteenth century, he appends the just remark: "This author, who wrote only in the thirteenth century, cannot be considered of great authority;"* the same remark may be made with intensified force about an author who wrote in the sixteenth. And we must confess that our confidence is shaken in the accuracy of the Count's pictorial and eloquent descriptions of monastic life, when we find him in this way ignoring the statements of all the ancient authorities, and drawing his material from what he admits himself to be a modern "legendary compilation."†

Another striking feature in the work before us, is the legendary colouring and additions so often given to what is substantially an authentic incident. When advantage is taken of any fact which Adamnan does state in a vague and general way, the details and colouring are sure to be derived either from the fabulous traditions of later times, or from the seemingly inexhaustible fountain of his own fancy. Take an instance, in regard to which nearly every modern who writes the story of Columba is no less a sinner than the Count: we mean the birthplace of the saint. It is not mentioned by any of the old Latin biographers; the nearest approach to it is when Adamnan represents the abbot as speaking of the north of Ireland as being "the region of his paternity." But Montalembert adopts the common tradition, that it was Gartan in the county Donegal, although the oldest authority for this is the old Irish Life, which O'Donnel took for his basis, and which was written in the tenth century. In other words, the oldest testimony to his birthplace is not old enough by three centuries to constitute historical evidence. Very little importance, in our judgment, attaches to the fact, which some no doubt would think decisive, that the statement is corroborated by the local traditions of the place; for it is quite possible that the bold unauthorised guess of some literary monk, seven or eight hundred

* "Monks of the West," Book ix., ch. v. p.209, note 2.

† Book ix., ch. i., p. 100, note 1.

years ago, may have produced the tradition, which at intervals since has flashed out from among the darkness and with which at present the whole atmosphere of the locality is charged.*

Another instance of the same peculiarity is presented in the story of Gemman, as told by Adamnan.† He mentions that when Columba was yet a youth and a deacon, gathering divine wisdom in Leinster, he was reading in the open air in company with an old man called Gemman, his master, when an incident occurred which the biographer goes on to describe. But the Count has a much more poetical way of telling the tale. "An old Christian bard (the bards were not all Christians) named Gemman, had come to live near the Abbot Finnian, asking from him in exchange for his poetry, the secret of fertilising the soil. Columba, who continued all his life a passionate admirer of the traditionary poetry of his nation, determined to join the school of the bard, and to share his labours and studies. The two were reading together out of doors, at a little distance from each other, when," &c.‡ Mark here the additions to the original statement of Adamnan. Gemman, it appears, is a bard, and he comes to live near the Abbot Finnian, and he is curious to know the secrets of agriculture, but has nothing except his poetry to give in exchange for more profitable though less romantic lore. Now Adamnan had not said one word of all this. On what authority, then, does the Count venture to to say it? All these details are derived, not from the original sources, but from a legendary life of St Finnian, contained in Colgan's *Acta Sanctorum*, and of no value as authentic history. There is no ground for saying that Columba was "a passionate admirer of the traditionary poetry of his nation"; except that after ages attributed to him the authorship of various Latin and Irish poems, which are now regarded as spurious. That the bard kept a school, and that the saint joined the school, is developed by the power of a fruitful imagination from the circumstance, that Adamnan calls Gemman the saint's *master*.

Let an additional example suffice to shew how the genius of the writer imparts to the writing a colour not found in the original. Adamnan tells that when the saint in Himba was about to excommunicate the sons of Conall, the son of Domnal, who were persecutors of the churches, one of their associates, instigated by the devil, rushed upon Columba to kill him with his spear. A monk called Finlunan, clothed in the saint's cowl, stepped in between the intending murderer and his

* An illustrative instance of this, as to the word *Grampians*, may be seen in Burton's "History of Scotland," vol. i., ch. i.

† Adamnan, B. ii., ch. xxv.

‡ The "Monks of the West," book ix., ch. i. p. 108.

victim. The dart failed to pierce the cowl as if it had been a coat of mail, and the monk remained unhurt. Lamdess, the assassin, fled after giving the murderous stroke, thinking that the deed was done. Exactly one year after, the saint in Iona said, "This day, twelve months ago, Lamdess did his best to slay Finlughan when he took my place: to-day, he himself is slain." So it happened. That very day Lamdess was slain by one Cronan, who, it is said, discharged his weapon in the name of St Columba.*

This is the substance of Adamnan's story; but it is plain unadorned prose. Let us now hear the Count relate the same incident, and let us notice how beautiful the most common fact appears, when there is a poet to set it forth, and to fling around it the rich robe of his own glowing fancy:—

"Among the reivers who infested Scottish Caledonia, making armed incursions into their neighbours' lands, and carrying on that system of pillage which up to the eighteenth century continued to characterise the existence of the Scottish clans, he had distinguished the sons of Donnel, who belonged to a branch of family which ruled the Dalriadan colony. Columba did not hesitate to excommunicate them. Exasperated by this sentence, one of these powerful ill-doers named or surnamed Lamm-Dess, took advantage of a visit which the great abbot paid to a distant island, and undertook to murder him in his sleep. But Finn-Lugh, one of the saint's companions, having had some suspicion or instinctive presentiment of danger, and desiring to save his father's life by the sacrifice of his own, borrowed Columba's cowl, and wrapped himself in it. The assassin struck him whom he found clothed in the well-known costume of the abbot, and then fled. But the sacred vestment proved impenetrable armour to the generous disciple, who was not even wounded. Columba, when informed of the event, said nothing at the moment. But a year after, when he had returned to Iona, the abbot said to his community, "A year ago Lamm-Dess did his best to murder my dear Finn-Lugh in my place; now, at this moment, it is he who is being killed." And in fact the news shortly arrived, that the assassin had just died under the sword of a warrior, who struck the fatal blow, while invoking the name of Columba, in a fight which brought the depredations of these reivers to an end."—*Monks of the West*, book ix. ch. vi., p. 246, 247.

This, all must admit, is a charming version of the incident, while the part which represents the attempted assassination as occurring at night gives a dramatic interest to the whole. It is needless to tell the reader, however, that Adamnan deserves no credit for that part of the story,

Under the class of *positive inaccuracies*, we have noted a number, none of them perhaps of great importance, but quite

* Ad. ii. 24.

enough to show that the Count looks at the whole subject from a poetical stand-point, and that without intending to deceive he communicates to his facts a colouring derived from foreign sources, which warns his readers to receive his statements with caution. We do not now refer to p. 173, where he quotes the 45th Psalm and calls it the *sixty-fourth*, nor to p. 241, where he represents a poor man's cattle as multiplied to *five hundred*, instead of to one hundred and five; these are most probably errors of the press. But it is very different, for instance, when he dwells prominently on such a topic as Columba's sympathy with the Irish bards, and his taste for the national poetry;* the fact being that Adamnan never speaks of him as using any other than sacred songs, while the one act of unkindness, not to say unpardonable cruelty, recorded of him, is his heartless treatment of one of that very class for whom we are now informed he cherished "a great and affectionate sympathy."† The Count speaks of his "prolonged prayers:" it is true he prayed often, and was known to shut himself up in his hut for two or three days at a time, but it does not appear that his prayers on any particular occasion were long—quite the contrary.‡ He represents Libran, an escaped slave and a penitent sinner, returning to Ireland to buy his freedom from his master, "carrying a sword with an *ivory* handle for his ransom:" whereas we are expressly told that the weapon was ornamented with wild beasts' teeth, and nothing is said of ivory.§ The poor man of Lochaber, whose story is told by Adamnan,|| the Count, without warrant from the record, designates throughout as *a poacher*, as if there had been game preserves upon the highland mountains in the sixth century!

It is well known how, long before the sceptic attempted to cut the knot by striking away everything supernatural in Christianity, there existed a great difference of opinion as to the alleged church miracles of mediæval times. Most of these are still received by Roman Catholics as well attested actual occurrences, as much entitled to credit as those recorded in the gospels. Protestants, on the other hand, have in general no faith in ecclesiastical miracles; they think that most of them are not sufficiently authenticated by the evidence of intelligent and trustworthy witnesses, that many of them were tricks or impostures, that some of them were mere coincidences, that others are explainable by natural causes, and that some few

* "Monks of the West," b. ix., ch. i. p. 114.

† Ad., b. i. ch. xlii.

‡ Orationem non prolixam.—Ad. iii. 19, i. 8.

§ Macheram belluinis ornatam dentibus.—Ad. ii. 29.

|| Ad. ii. 31.

are anomalous facts, for which no adequate explanation can be offered. It puzzles us to say on what side the Count stands in this controversy. At one time we find him hewing his way through a thicket of miracles, lopping off the supernatural at every stroke with as little scruple as the keenest and most cold-blooded philosopher; while at others, the critical faculty refuses absolutely to discharge its functions, and the hugest fable is not too huge for the receptive power of his faith. The oldest biographers of Columba repeatedly state in illustration of the abbot's miraculous gifts, that the sea was calmed and the wind turned at his prayer—all of which the Count understands simply to mean, "that the monastic apostle of Caledonia, apart from the prevailing efficacy of his prayers, *had made an attentive study of the winds and of all the phenomena of nature*, which affected the lives of the insular and maritime people whom he sought to lead into Christianity."* When the legend tells how, at a stamp of his foot, fountains sprung from the earth, and how by his prayers he lowered the waterfall at Ballyshannon to allow the salmon to ascend the river Erne in the fishing season, the Count recognises in this "the most touching expression of popular and national gratitude for the services which the great monk rendered to the country, by *teaching the peasants to search for the fountains*, to regulate irrigations, and to *rectify the course of the rivers*, as so many holy monks have done in all European lands."† When the saint is represented as turning the sour crab at Durrow into a sweet apple tree, by pronouncing a blessing upon it, the Count remarks that it is "apparent that he had with zeal and success *established the system of grafting and the culture of fruit trees*."‡ The expertest Protestant could not cut the root of a monkish miracle with more dexterity than this. Indeed Dr Reeves, the ablest and best editor of Adamnan, when annotating these miracles, illustrates the most absurd of them with as much care and as much gravity as if he were elucidating admitted historical facts; while the Count, who is not a Protestant clergyman, does not scruple virtually to say, that, in some cases, at least, it was superior knowledge, which monkish credulity and ignorance elevated to the rank of supernatural power. In such cases, he deserves praise for giving expression to his honest convictions.

But we regret to say that in the majority of cases we can find no such proof of judgment and impartiality. Again and again the Count seems to receive as true the wildest fables, and to enter them on his pages as the facts of sober history.

* "Monks of the West," b. ix., ch. vi. p. 280.

† *Ibid*, vol. iii. 285.

‡ *Ibid*, book ix., ch. vi. p. 285.

That St Columba in the sixth century performed real miracles, he believes as firmly as he believes that Peter and John cured the cripple at the gate of the Temple. "Making all possible allowance," says he, "for the exaggeration and fables which the proverbial credulity of Celtic nations have added to the legends of their saints, no Christian will be tempted to deny the verified narratives, which bear witness in Columba's case, as well as in that of the other saints, to *supernatural appearances*, which enriched his life, and especially his old age. Those wonderful soldiers of virtue and Christian truth needed such miracles to help them to support the toils and live through the trials of their dangerous mission."* In accordance with this, he believes devoutly that Columba, like Elijah, restored a dead child to life, and he describes the process in full detail.† He believes that the saint cured ophthalmia with the use of a little "blessed salt," and that by sending a piece of "blessed bread" all the way from Iona to Ireland, he wrought another cure there upon "a holy girl who had broken her leg in returning from mass."‡ In short, the fish in the river Ness, whom the Count represents as *swallowing* one of the natives,§ did not display more wonderful powers of absorption than this distinguished and brilliant writer, whose capacious faith can receive any amount of miracle and fable as if it were the plainest historical fact. He betrays, however, the secret of his wonderful power in this respect, when he states his sentiments in the following words:—"Although animated by a lively and simple faith in the supernatural, I have recourse to it only *when the church ordains*, or when all natural explanation fails to interpret undeniable facts."|| So it all comes to this, that like an obedient son of the church he can believe when he is bidden. A man who can thus voluntarily surrender his understanding to the will of others, and believe or not believe as he is told, is certainly saved from a world of doubts, by which many are perplexed. Were this power universal, and universally exercised, the age of miracles would last to the end; the fact being that unbelief itself is not more fatal to the existence of a modern miracle than the independent exercise of one's own understanding. The man who is gifted with the capacity to shut his eyes and to believe implicitly *when the church ordains*, is in possession of a stone, which, though not

* "Monks of the West," book ix., ch. vii. p. 256-257.

† *Ibid*, b. ix., ch. iii. p. 174.

‡ *Ibid*, b. ix., ch. vi. p. 237.

§ *Ibid*, p. 222. Adamnan speaks of the native being bitten by the fish and dying in consequence, but the Count, as usual, finishes off the bald narrative in his own way.

|| *Ibid*, introduction, ch. x. p. 240.

exactly the philosopher's, yet nevertheless can transmute legend into miracle, fable into fact, dust into gold.

After an extensive survey of the system of Christianity which Columba introduced into the highlands and islands of Scotland, the Count reaches the conclusion that it was identical with the Romish Christianity of our own age, and affirms "the absolute conformity of the monastic life of Columba and his monks to the precepts and rites of the Catholic Church in all ages." "Authorities," he goes on to say, "unquestionable and unquestioned, demonstrate the existence of auricular confession, the invocation of saints, the universal faith in their protection and intervention in temporal affairs, the celebration of the mass, the real presence in the Eucharist, ecclesiastical celibacy, fasts and abstinences, prayer for the dead, the sign of the cross, and, above all, the assiduous and profound study of the Holy Scriptures."*

It is an interesting inquiry how far this statement is correct. That there is some truth in it we believe as firmly as we believe that it is not true to the extent that the Count imagines. After a somewhat careful inquiry, we are convinced that in the North British Church of the fifth and sixth centuries, some of the doctrines and rites of the Romish system as it now exists were in full bloom, others were only in process of development, while others were entirely unknown.

Among the rites and opinions which were then in existence, we may specify the sign of the cross, celibacy, and asceticism, as indicative of a higher type of Christian virtue, and the miraculous efficacy supposed to attach to holy water and to holy salt. The cross entered as much into the every-day life of Iona, as into that of the Christians of the second century. The sign of salvation, as it was called, was used by Columba when he drives demons out of a vessel of milk, when he intimidates a river monster from biting one of his companions, when he blesses a butcher's knife, and opens the gate of the King of the Picts.† At an earlier age it was not unusual for ecclesiastics to be married men,—a fact of which we have a well-known instance in the father and grandfather of St Patrick; but now a century or two later, in the age of Columba, a more pretentious morality makes its appearance, and those who aspire to the higher summits of Christian life forsake the society of women, build monasteries, and voluntarily choose a life of poverty and labour. Every Christian of the time who aims at perfection, sells what he has and turns an ascetic. It is remarkable that in none of the ancient authorities, is there the slightest hint given that any female resided in Iona, or

Ibid, book ix, ch. viii. p. 284.

† Adam. ii. 16, 27, 29, 85.

even visited the island during the lifetime of Columbkille. The religious feeling of that age ran strongly in favour of monasticism,—monasteries for men and convents for women. Adamnan cannot be studied, or even read, without this thought forcing itself on the attention of the reader. No less is it true that virtue was then attached to water and to salt that were blessed by the saint,—indeed, quite as much as would be attached to them at this day among the glens of Ennishowen or the wilds of Connemara.*

Further, some modern doctrines and practices give unmistakeable symptoms of their presence; though it is not for some ages after that they reach their full development. One of these is the practice of *confession*. It is no unusual thing for a man whose conscience is burdened with the weight of some crime to unburden himself to the saint, and to submit to any penance which he may choose to impose. But this is an occasional, abnormal thing, to which a man is driven under the impulse of a quickened conscience. A man confesses only when he feels that he has need of it.† As yet it has not become a religious service binding upon all men; every man is not yet under an injunction to do it to his own priest; no man has as yet to go through the form at stated times every year, whether conscience prompts him or not. When all these rules are enforced, the system of auricular confession shall have been developed; but it is only the rude germ that we find existing in the days of Columba.

The same may be said of the eucharist. In the time under review, we find that the officiating presbyter is designated a priest, the place at which he stands is the altar, his employment there is to make “the Lord’s body,” the ordinance itself is styled “a sacrificial mystery,” and the whole service is over and over again designated “a mass.” All this, to say the least, is suspicious; and although it is not impossible to give all this, by the exercise of a little ingenuity, a Protestant interpretation, it is certainly language which no real Protestant would now employ, and contains within it the rough material out of which the whole edifice of transubstantiation and of the sacrifice of the mass was afterwards built. On the other hand, the language in which the ordinance is described is much too vague to warrant us to say that Columba, or even his biographer a century later, had risen to the conception of transubstantiation. Indeed, it is probable that neither of them had; but, except language is intended to conceal rather than to explain thought, the church of that time had advanced far beyond the early

* Adam ii. 7, 17.

† Adam. i. 80, 40, 50; ii. 88, 89.

apostolic views of the subject. The terms used are subjoined ; let the reader judge.*

Another practice of the same kind is that of the *invocation of saints*. In no case whatever is Columba represented as praying to saint or angel, or imploring them to intercede with God on his behalf. The biographers describe the angels as waiting on his person and executing his commands ; but in no instance whatever does he avail himself of their supposed influence with God in order to obtain any blessing either for others or himself. In no case, when he prays, is he represented as praying to any other than to the Supreme Being. But the biographer tells of various persons in Ireland, crying for assistance in their distress to Columba, then alive in Iona, and asserts, that the saint away beyond the sea knew inwardly at the moment that his aid was invoked, and responded to the call.† Not only so, but he informs the reader that he himself and other monks made use of the influence which Columba after death had with God, laid relics of him upon the altar, sought the saint's help in their extremity, and in this manner obtained the blessings which they desired.‡ Though not in the practice of the abbot, yet in the superstition of the times, which he does not appear to have discountenanced, we have the germ of the *invocation of saints*, which forms at this day a prominent feature in the Romish worship.

In the same way we find that, in the time of Columba, the names of dead saints were introduced into the church ritual.§ The object of this at first was no doubt highly commendable ; it was to thank God for all that his grace had done in them and by them, and for their happy release from the toils of life. Yet out of this pious practice was evolved in due time the custom of offering prayers for the dead.

The seeds of error, it will thus appear, were abundant in the ancient churches of Ireland and North Britain ; for the latter took origin from the former, and they were virtually one. It is quite deceptive to speak, as some still do, of her doctrines as fundamentally "sound and scriptural." In no way could this be said of her, that the same might not be said of the Church of Rome at the present hour. Whatever errors may be supposed to have attached themselves to the latter in the course of ages, none will venture to deny that she holds by such doctrines as the trinity, the incarnation, the passion, and resur-

* "Presbyterum sacra eucharistiæ mysteria conficientem," Adam. i. 40 ; "Christi corpus ex more conficere . . . dominicum panem frangerent," Adam. i. 44 ; "Missarum sollemnia celebrarentur," Adam. iii. 17 ; "Vinum ad sacrificale mysterium," Adam. ii. 1.

† Adam. ii. 5, 13, 39, 40.

‡ Adam. ii. 44, 45.

§ Adam. iii. 12.

rection of the Lord, the divine institution of the church, the supernatural origin of Scripture, and a future state of rewards and punishments. However darkened these grand truths may be by accretions of error in the lapse of centuries, it can scarcely be affirmed of any church which holds them, that her fundamental doctrines are not sound and scriptural. But what may be fairly charged against the Romish system is, that with these fundamental doctrines it combines a multitude of doctrines, and practices, and rites, and ceremonies, which are human and earthly in their origin, and which obscure the lustre of the fundamental doctrines that she holds. The very same thing, only to a more limited extent, may be said of the church of St Columba. Her fundamental doctrines might justly enough be said to be sound and scriptural, but, nevertheless, there was in her a manifest departure from the purity of the faith. It had not made the same advance in error as the Rome of our times; but the same might be said of the church of any nation in Christendom in that age. Even Rome herself in the sixth century was very far indeed from shewing the doctrinal and ritual developments that she presents in the nineteenth. In every country there were then stains on the robe of Christianity, but in no country were those stains so broad and deep as they became in after ages.

The truth of this remark will be still more evident when it is considered, that there are some principles and practices now prominent in the Romish system, which were then entirely unknown.

Among these we may specify the peculiar honour and *adoration lavished upon the virgin Mary*. Not to speak of the immaculate conception, which has in our own time been raised to the position of an article of faith, one has only to look at the quotations collected in Pusey's *Eirenicon* out of works of Romish devotion, in order to be convinced what an important element the worship of the Virgin is at this moment in that form of piety which Roman Catholics most approve. But even the Count de Montalembert must have noticed, though, so far as we remember, he has forgotten to state, what must, to all who think as he does, appear strange and unaccountable, that neither Patrick nor Columbkille, so far as any ancient authority informs us, ever mentioned her name. If the Virgin at that time received the same spiritual homage as now, it is the strangest of all strange facts, that she is never so much as named in the genuine writings of Patrick, nor in anything that Cummen, Adamnan, and Bede, have written about the founder of Iona.

Of the doctrine of *purgatory* the same can be affirmed. It

is never mentioned in anything that these writers have said about Columba. On the contrary, there is evidence in abundance that such an idea never entered into the saint's thoughts of the future state. The language used by his main biographer, and by him attributed to the saint, utterly excludes the idea of delay between the departure of the soul from the body and its entrance on the eternal reward. The invariable representation is, that the righteous are carried by the good angels to heaven, and the wicked borne by the demons to hell. The deep impression left upon the reader is, that, in the belief both of Columba and his biographer, there is no third place beyond this world for the disembodied spirit to enter upon. The death of a Christian is constantly spoken of as "passing to the Lord," "going to Christ," "migrating to the heavenly country."* The home of the saved soul is Paradise, which is identified with heaven, and has its position fixed beyond the starry sky, and is described as a place of eternal enjoyment.† Demons, on the other hand, carry off the wicked directly to hell.‡ Such passages prove, as we think, clearly, that Columba and Adamnan know of only one, out of the two places beyond this world, awaiting every individual of the race. The reader, however who makes acquaintance for the first time with the Caledonian saint in the pages of the "Monks of the West" will not fail to carry away the impression that he was a firm believer in purgatory—that is, an impression the very opposite of the truth. Indeed, what other impression could he have when he reads such language as the following, employed by the Count, to describe the whirlpool of Corryvreckan among the western islands?

"The winds," says he, "when blowing from certain directions, hollow out in their whirl such terrible abysses about this spot, that even to our own time it has continued the terror of sailors. The holiest of Columba's guests passed it by with trembling, raising their hands towards heaven to implore the miracle which alone could save them. But he himself, who one day was almost swallowed up in it, and whose mind was continually preoccupied by the recollection of his kindred, imagined that he saw in this whirlpool a symbol of the torments endured in purgatory by the soul of his relative, who had perished at that spot, and of the duty of praying for the repose

* Death is spoken of in the following terms:—"Ad Dominum transiit," Adam. iii. 23; "Ad Christum Dominum migravit," Adam. i. 31; "Ad coelestem patriam transmeantis," Adam. iii. 23.

† "Ad coelum ab angelis portatur . . . qui nunc ab angelis Dei in paradysum deductus est," Adam. iii. 7; "Ultra sidera coelorum spatia ad paradysum ascendit," Adam. iii. 12; "Dei ad paradysum evehunt . . . ad aeternae refrigerationis locum," Adam. iii. 10.

‡ "Daemones ad inferna rapiunt," Adam. i. 35; ii. 22, 23.

of that soul at the same time as he prayed for the safety of the companions of his voyage." *

No one of course could read this without taking from it the impression that Columba was a devout believer in purgatory, and was in the habit of praying for the repose of the souls of dead men. But when the case is sifted, it turns out that there is not one word of this in any of the ancient authorities; the sole witness referred to by the author is Manus O'Donnel, the sixteenth century writer, already so often named, who personally knew nothing of the matter, and who composed his work out of the trashy stories told by the peasantry, and from written sources of a very questionable kind. Unaware of the changes which a thousand years had wrought in the religious sentiments of the world, the old chieftain of Tyrconnel put feelings into the mind and words into the lips of Columba, of which the saint knew nothing, but which, had he lived in the sixteenth century, it would perhaps have been natural enough for him to entertain and express. It would be childish, however, in any man to accept such representations as historical.

Another very remarkable thing in the Church of Columba, is one to which the Count himself calls attention,† the absence of all territorial episcopacy. The abbot is supreme at Iona. All in the island are under him, and he is under none, either within the island or beyond it. No trace of a bishop residing there is discoverable during the lifetime of the Founder. One, indeed, is represented as visiting it *incognito*, and when his ecclesiastical rank is discovered, he is treated with respect, and the honour is devolved upon him of presiding at the public service, and dispensing the eucharist.‡ Occasionally some strange bishop would arrive at the monastery on a visit to the abbot, and there is an instance of one being called upon in the monastery of a neighbouring island to perform the rite of ordination: but the bishop of the Columba Church is a very humble personage indeed; his office and his personal character are his only recommendations: he is void alike of temporal rank, territorial power, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. "Dioceses and parishes," as the Count truly observes, "were only constituted in the twelfth century," that is, six centuries after Columba. The bishop seldom makes his appearance in the pages of Adamnan, and when he does appear, he is overshadowed by the abbot; and the abbot at Iona, was, as every one knows, a simple presbyter only.

Farther, it is noteworthy that the original biographers of

* "Monks of the West," book ix., ch. vi., p. 221-22.

† *Ibid.* book ix. ch. viii. p. 281.

‡ Ad. i. 44.

the saint, make no mention of the Roman Pontiff, or of the Roman Church, or of any ecclesiastical obedience due to the one or to the other by the Christians of Caledonia or Ireland. Bede himself was a warm partisan of the Romish customs and of the Romish Church, but he never leads his readers to suppose that the same could be said of Columba. Adamnan was himself an abbot of Iona, who succeeded the founder within a century from his death, and therefore was in circumstances to know the real facts of the case. In his work, he never names the Pope nor the Church of Rome. The Roman city is twice mentioned; in the one case it is barely named, in the other, speaking of the fame of Columba, he says it reached "the Roman city itself—the head of all cities."* It was natural enough for an islander, inhabiting what might be called the *Ultima Thule* of Christendom, and personally unacquainted with the great cities of the East, to speak of Rome, even in its decline, as the first of cities—the capital of the world, without saying or thinking that he owed to it and its bishop any ecclesiastical obedience. If a man in New Zealand or Japan, with some geographical knowledge a little in advance of his countrymen, were to speak of London as the head of all cities, it would not follow from this that he considers himself bound to do spiritual homage to the Archbishop of Canterbury. There is no evidence that the thought of ecclesiastical fealty to any foreign, or even domestic ruler, ever entered the mind of Columba.

As to the Holy Scriptures, for "whose assiduous and profound study," a claim is put forward on behalf of the Primitive Church of Caledonia, the facts are these. Passages were constantly read in the public service; the psalter was sung in public and in private; manuscript copies were executed in monasteries of that age, and there was certainly no other books with which the monks of that age were so well acquainted. This is shewn by the fact that the monastic productions of the time quote Scripture far more frequently than any uninspired work whatever. But along with this, it must be kept in view, that the general ignorance of the age was profound, the number of people able to read was small, and books of all kinds were comparatively rare. These facts account for the circumstance, that while no ecclesiastical ban was as yet put upon the Bible, the mass of men were practically ignorant of it, incompetent to study it profoundly, and cherished many opinions and practices utterly at variance with it. This was the case over all Christendom in that age, no less than in

* Ad. ii. 46. "Pervenire ipsam quoque Romanam civitatem, quæ caput est omnium civitatum."—iii. 23.

Scotland and Ireland, as is proved by the degenerate literature of the time. The only restriction then upon the use of Holy Scripture, was the restriction imposed by the absence of the schoolmaster and the printing-press. It was not till the sixteenth century, when Rome lost almost half her subjects, and traced the disaster to the popular use of Scripture in the vulgar tongue, that the pontifical ban was put upon the writings in which Christianity is revealed, and men were told that the use of the simple word of God, without the authorised command of the church, and the permission of the priest, is heresy and a crime.

The conclusion that we reach, after a careful examination of the subject is, that it is quite a mistake to assert with some Protestants, that the British and Irish Christians of the sixth century were free from the Romish doctrines and practices of the age, and to claim them virtually as Protestant churches; while it is equally unfounded to talk, as the Count does, of "*the absolute conformity* of the monastic life of Columba and his monks, to the precepts and rites of the Catholic Church *in all ages.*" Neither statement is absolutely true, but the truth lies between them. Various rites and practices were observed by Columba, which all true Protestantism would now repudiate, while to various doctrines and practices which Roman Christianity has since admitted, Columba was entirely a stranger. The church at that time in no country had advanced so far in the direction of human additions, as the Romish Church has since done; but in Iona, as in every other place, the seeds of error were sprouting rankly up, destined to yield in due time bitter and poisonous fruit. Such are the real facts. To this interesting portion of our national history, it were well if all could come with unpolemic and impartial eye, and try to discover the actual state of the case. Truth to every man should be dearer than the interests of party. The truth, when fully known, will not, we are persuaded, be all that either a warm Protestant or a zealous Roman Catholic could wish.

We cannot part from this able and eloquent writer without expressing our regret that we cannot give him the praise of a true historian. He is deficient in accuracy; he fails to draw the line between fact and fiction with a stern and a firm hand; he derives a large portion of his material from writers who had no means whatever of knowing personally the matters which they profess to describe, and who are known to have raked together the popular fictions of their time; his very facts are presented through a coloured medium which did not originally belong to them; and the product is sent out to the world as if it were a record of recognised and admitted truth. He looks at men and things with a poet's eye, and is gifted with the

power of shewing them to his readers as they are seen by himself. One peruses his book with the same sort of feeling that he peruses a lofty epic ; he is charmed with its flowing style, and startling images, and brilliant descriptions, but is painfully conscious all the while that he is wandering through the fairy realms of fancy, not plodding the dull rough road of sober historic reality. His religious earnestness, his literary power, his poetic genius, win our admiration ; but it is a very different thing when we come to weigh his statements in the balance of truth—the ultimate test by which everything that professes to be history, and not poetry, must submit to be tried. Tested in this way, his grandest paragraphs and most striking incidents, dwindle insensibly down to the smallest particle of fact, or melt away altogether, like a snow-flake in the sunshine. Where the application of the test indicates the presence of truth, the pure metal has constantly and carefully to be parted from the dross. His beautiful pictures elicit our admiration, but then we are never able to forget how very different the reality was. The Count fights as valiantly with his pen, as any of his ancestors ever fought with weapons of keener edge, or of more deadly aim ; but no man knows better than himself that he fights in a hopeless cause. The consciousness that he pleads at the bar of the world on behalf of an institution which the world has virtually condemned, is never absent from his mind ; and the sense of this falls like a dark shadow on the brightest pages of his book. Monasticism is a prisoner, against whom a verdict of guilty has been recorded, and who, before the judge dons the black cap, rises to say, through the Count's lips, why sentence of death should not be pronounced upon him ; he may make, as he has done, a very eloquent and a very affecting speech, but the judge pronounces sentence notwithstanding, and justice must take its course.

Monasticism, there can be little doubt, is virtually dead this moment. The Count admits it had its faults ; and we, on our part, will not be so ungrateful as to say that it did not serve the world in its time. But it were as idle now to attempt to save it from its doom, as to bring back the Vestal Virgins, or to recall the Amphictyonic Council into life. Once, perhaps, the world had need of such an institution, but it needs it now no more. Once, at least, the current of the world's opinion ran strongly in its favour ; but now it runs with force irresistible in the opposite direction. The demand of our time is for something new,—for a creation of the present, at once vigorous and strong, not for a reconstruction of the old and the effete. In the ever onward progress of humanity, new institutions and new combinations will arise, specially adapted to the society and times which produce them, and much more likely to be

useful than any revived organisation of the past. One generation of the human succeeds another, the divine alone is immortal. Human institutions, like their authors, must of necessity grow old, and pass away, and leave room for others to succeed them. Let the dead past bury its dead. The wisdom of humanity is to improve the present, and to look forward to the future with hopefulness and faith.

ART. II.—*Cambridge Characteristics in the 17th Century.*

Cambridge Characteristics in the 17th Century. By JAMES BASS MULLINGER, B.A., St John's College, Cambridge. London and Cambridge: Macmillan & Co. 1867.

PRIZE essays are not for the most part very inviting productions. Even when written, as they sometimes are, by men of real learning and ability, their style is so ambitious, the desire for display is so painfully evident, that they are seldom read except by those on whom the duty falls of deciding upon their merits, or by those feeling a personal interest in the writers. There are of course exceptions to the general neglect to which this class of literature is consigned, and Mr Mullinger's essay deserves the exceptional favour due to a sensible and pleasant book. Although written in the first instance to obtain the approval of academic judges, it is entirely free from pedantry and rhetorical display. So far from obtruding himself unduly on the notice of his readers, the essayist frequently hides himself altogether behind well-chosen quotations, and allows contemporaries and eye-witnesses to tell the story of the eventful times to which his subject carries him. By this means, and by his own well written sketches, he has contrived to give us, in the compass of a very small volume, many a pleasant glimpse of those scenes and characters which, however familiar, Englishmen feel they can scarcely look upon too often. The essayist was certainly fortunate in his subject. Cambridge was a well chosen point from which to survey England during the 17th century. The historian of Cambridge, without going out of his way, may touch upon almost everything that was most important in the political and intellectual life of England in the period; for Cambridge was in one way or another connected with it all. Macaulay, in his essay on Bacon, has claimed for his own university a larger and more honourable part in the great movements of the 16th century than

478 *Cambridge Characteristics in the 17th Century.*

for its more ancient and splendid rival. "Cambridge," he says, "had the honour of educating those celebrated Protestant bishops whom Oxford had the honour of burning; and at Cambridge were formed the minds of all those statesmen to whom chiefly is to be attributed the secure establishment of the reformed religion in the north of Europe." In the 17th century, the position of Cambridge was scarcely less important; then, as formerly, it could claim connection with many of the foremost men of the age. Mr Mullinger thus pleasantly introduces us to some of the notable men who were to be found in the streets and colleges of Cambridge some years after the beginning of the century:—

"Let us, then, step back some two centuries, and endeavour to reproduce to our mental vision, the Cambridge of those days. We shall miss many a noble structure as we move through her streets; we shall meet here and there some familiar face which the painter's canvas has preserved to posterity; and we may mark not a few in the humble garb of a studious undergraduateship, destined to leave to their countrymen a bright example, and to win a deathless fame. We see Milton, with his maiden face, hardly on the best terms with the authorities at Christ's, but already gaining credit by his epigrams and exercises; Fuller, the future church historian, the quaint humourist, to whom is reserved the task of chronicling with filial affection the history of his own Alma Mater; Henry More, the Platonist, 'a tall thin youth, of clear olive complexion, and a wrapt expression;' Seth Ward, my future lord bishop, with his flaxen hair, and boyish stature, winning, sadly to his own discomfiture, the attention of grave seniors whenever he ventures beyond the walls of Sydney; Cleveland, the satirist, and Crashaw, the sweet lyric poet, both already giving promise of their future powers; Pearson, the interpreter of the faith to many a succeeding generation; Cudworth, destined to a foremost place in philosophic thought; Mede, now a senior fellow at Christ's, deep in astrology and apocalyptic studies; Jeremy Taylor, just elected to his fellowship at Caius; all these, two hundred and thirty-five years ago, might probably have been met on the same day in the streets of Cambridge."

Notwithstanding the great names to which Cambridge can point as adorning her halls of learning at this time, we shall greatly deceive ourselves if we imagine it to have been a scene of cloistered peace and innocence. Reckless and wicked living prevailed, even among the younger students, to a great extent. Sir Simond D'Ewes, who was afterwards a member of the Long Parliament, has left in his diary a damning record of the state of matters in his day. Writing as a fellow commoner of St John's, in the year 1620, he says, "But the main thing which made me weary of the College, was that swearing, drinking, rioting, and hatred of all piety and virtue, under false and adulterate

names, did abound there, and generally in all the university. Nay, the very sin of lust began to be known and practised by very boys, so that I was fain to live almost a recluse's life, conversing chiefly in our own college with the honester fellows thereof." Although Mr Mullinger, as a true son of the University, endeavours to soften in some degree the dark shadow of this picture, he is obliged, as a candid historian, to own that it is in all probability substantially correct. As a timid and somewhat austere man, D'Ewes may have judged some things rather severely, but in the main we must accept his account as the view that most good men in England at the time took of the state of Cambridge. "What such men as Hampden, Digby, Capel, Palmer, Hyde, and Falkland would have said of Cambridge, is probably very much what D'Ewes did say."

One cause probably of the demoralised state of the university at this period was the relaxation of the ancient discipline. In former times, the conduct of the students had been regulated by very strict rules. They were forbidden to go into taverns, or to attend fairs. They were not to be seen at boxing matches, skittle playings, dancings, or at any similar amusements. And to enforce the observance of these rules, no student was permitted to go into town unaccompanied by his tutor or a master of arts. These regulations had latterly been very much relaxed; probably with altered times, it was found impossible to preserve them in their ancient rigour; and except in these rare cases, where there existed self-restraint and high principle, the removal of the restrictions appears to have been followed by evil consequences. The dramatic entertainments, which were at this time so popular, in which the students took part, and which were patronised by the authorities, had probably something to do with the loose state of morals. Dr Isaac Barrow said of these entertainments somewhat later, "that they were a principal cause of the licentiousness then prevalent." And it is not likely that at this period their influence was more healthy. There evidently existed, however, a party in the university who were opposed to the prevailing frivolity. In 1632, when Charles I. and his Queen paid a visit to Cambridge, a play was acted before them by the students. D'Ewes, whose testimony we have cited above, has left us an account of his feelings on the occasion. "The King and Queen," he writes, "came from Newmarket to Trinity College. Whilst they were at an idle play there, which gave offence to most of the hearers, I went into Trinity College library, and there viewed divers ancient manuscripts, which afforded me as much content as the sight of the extreme vanity of the court did sorrow." Milton has likewise left on record the impression which the university theatricals made upon him in his earnest college

days. "But since there is such necessity to the hearsay of a tire, a periwig, or a vizard, that plays must have been seen, what difficulty was there in that, when in the colleges so many of the young divines, and those of next aptitude to divinity, have been seen so oft upon the stage, writhing and unboning their clergy limbs to all the antic and dishonest gestures of trinculoes, buffoons, and bauds, prostituting the shame of that ministry, which either they had or were nigh having, in the eyes of the courtiers and court ladies, with their grooms and mademoiselles? There, while they acted and over acted among other young scholars, I was a spectator: they thought themselves gallant men, and I thought them fools; they made sport, and I laughed; they mispronounced, and I disliked; and to make up the Atticism, they wore out, and I hissed."

We have from various quarters evidence that there existed at this time at Cambridge, an earnest minority opposed to frivolities and devoted to grave studies. Curiously enough, theology appears to have had no authorised place in the curriculum; and the reason of this strange omission was, not that no interest was felt in the subject, but that the interest was of so fervid and fiery a kind, that the college authorities, with true Anglican caution, judged it better to ignore the subject altogether, than "to introduce what might prove an element of discord into the daily routine of instruction." But there were men in Cambridge for whom theology possessed too absorbing an interest to permit them to rest satisfied with the safe silence which was regarded by the authorities as the highest wisdom. Mr Mullinger gives us some pleasant pictures of the labours of those unrecognised teachers. We get glimpses of young men meeting in their tutors' room each morning and evening to read the Scriptures together. We hear of a certain Mr William Chapell, fellow of Christ's College, who *armenianised* his pupils, and of another who "did commend unto them to read the lives of all the holy men of old time, and saints of God, the good fathers of the church, and of those good men in our later times, even in the Church of England, the saints and holy martyrs." Of Whichcot it is said, that "he studied to raise those who conversed with him to a nobler set of thoughts, and to consider religion as a seed of a deiform nature (to use one of his own phrases). In order to this, he set young students much on reading the ancient philosophers, chiefly Plato, Tully, and Plotin, and on considering the Christian religion as a doctrine sent from God both to elevate and sweeten human nature, in which he was a great example as well as a wise and kind instructor." And about Henry More, "the angel of Christ's Church," his biographer has given the following account:—"A very sober person and quondam pupil

of his told me what pains he would take with those under him; and, among other things, what excellent lectures he would deliver to them of piety and instruction from the chapter that was read on nights in his chamber." Such traits relieve the somewhat dark picture we get of the condition of faith and morals in the university at this period. Not a few of the better influences of the place may be traced to the Puritans, who still possessed considerable power. During the reign of Elizabeth, in Cambridge as well as in Oxford, the Puritans, though a minority, were an active and influential party. Their doctrines were sometimes preached in the most uncompromising form from the pulpits of the universities, and although the Queen herself was not favourable to them, many of her ablest ministers, Cecil among others, had strong Puritanical leanings, and gave to the party what support and countenance they were able. When, in the beginning of the century, the great Queen died, and the crown of England was placed upon the head of a Scottish king, hopes were entertained that the lovers of the theology and church government of Geneva would receive the royal countenance. So far as the question was purely theological, James might have been disposed to favour Calvinism. Indeed, he appears to have been intellectually a Calvinist; he was, as is well known, a determined and somewhat unfair promoter of the decisions of the Synod of Dort. But James was guided in his public as well as in his private dealings, far more by personal feeling than by the abstract claims of truth and righteousness. From the first he had recognised in the Puritan clergy an ominous resemblance to the unbending northern ministers, by whom he had been so often thwarted and rebuked, and he resolved if possible to crush them. His sentiments very soon became apparent. In the second year of his reign, he presided, in his own drawing room at Hampton Court, at a conference of the leaders of the opposing parties. At this conference the Puritans were in every possible manner humiliated and insulted by the royal president. He told Dr Reynolds, their distinguished leader, that if a schoolboy did not answer better than he had done he would be flogged. It was at this conference that James made his famous declaration about Presbytery. "If you aim," said he, "at a Scotch Presbytery, it agreeth as well with monarchy as God and the devil . . . for no bishop no king." The bishops fully repaid the royal patron for the favour he showed to them. They declared that he spoke by the special inspiration of God's Spirit, and one right reverend prelate fell on his knees on the drawing-room floor, and exclaimed, "I protest my heart melteth with joy, that almighty God of his singular mercy hath given us such a king as since Christ's time hath not been seen."

It was not unnatural that the Puritans should be disappointed to find that the theological sovereign regarded them with so hostile an eye. It is difficult for us now to realise the importance which in those days attached to the smile or frown of a king. But it was in reality a most fortunate event for the moral influence of the Puritans in England, that the weak and worthless son of Mary Stuart did not take to patronising them. Under such a patronage Puritanism might have easily degenerated into a thorny scholasticism, and ceased to be a power over the consciences of men ; but standing as it did apart, disapproving, and disapproved, it silently won to itself the sympathies of the noblest and most patriotic Englishmen of the time. The other party enjoyed the royal favour, but, as Mr Mullinger justly says, "not much to their own advantage. The prestige of a church whose supreme power ordained that the Book of Sports should receive the sanction of her pulpits, was lowered in the eyes of all religious men ; and it must be owned that it henceforth appears as the misfortune rather than any part of the strength of the Church of England, that her reputation seemed necessarily to some extent involved in that of her temporal head." And another Anglican historian tells us, "Grave divines danced attendance at the levee of a profligate favourite, and thought it necessary to be continually at hand to watch that the reversion which had been promised to them was not snapt up by another."

To return, however, to Cambridge and its studies. The barren logic and rhetoric which had excited the wrathful contempt of young Bacon half a century earlier, were still the leading studies of the place, and the disputations at the schools remained the accredited road to academical distinction. "The enthusiasm," we are told, "elicited by one of these encounters, when taking place between antagonists of much reputation, almost equalled that which in modern times a contest for the champion's belt excites in the admirers of the ring." But other and more useful studies had also, since the previous century, found a place in the curriculum. The classics were still studied with something of the enthusiasm which attaches to the exploring of a newly discovered region, and if the scholarship of the time was not equal in elegance and refinement to that which was afterwards reached by English scholars, there never was a period when the reading of the students embraced so wide a range. The fathers and the Neo-Platonists, as well as the ordinary classical authors, were at this time familiar to the scholars of Cambridge. Mathematics were taught, but only in their elements, and physical science of course not at all. Modern enlightenment may be disposed to regard such a range of study as narrow and pedantic, but it

ought not at all events to be forgotten, that not a few of those trained in this system left a broad mark in the literature of England. One school of the writers of the time call for special notice from their connection with Cambridge. "It would make a delightful and instructive essay," says Mr Coleridge, "to draw up a critical, and where possible, biographical account of the latitudinarian party at Cambridge, from the close of the reign of James I. to the earlier half of Charles II." Mr Mullinger, without attempting all that Coleridge desired, has made a contribution towards it. He describes them "as a distinct school of religious thought and legitimate growth of the Cambridge training of that day ; a class of thinkers inured to habits of close reasoning and subtle distinction, by the study of Aristotle and the logicians ; to lofty and glowing philosophic speculation, by the perusal of Plato and Cicero, of Plotinus and Porphyry ; and taught to cultivate a deeply reverential spirit in matters of religious belief, by the example of such writers as Augustine and Chrysostom."

The bond of union between More, Smith, Cudworth, and others of this school, was not political, nor even theological, but philosophical. In their political, and even in their theological leanings, they appear to have differed, but they were at one in their desire to form a Christian philosophy, and the same vein of mystic speculation may be traced in all. Coleridge says that although they called themselves Platonists, they were more truly Plotinists. And this criticism appears to be correct. The influence of the Neo-Platonists, and of the Church fathers, who had imbibed the spirit of the schools of Alexandria rather than of Plato, is to be traced in their writings. One of the best known, at all events one of the most typical, of the school, was the gentle tutor of Christ's Church, Dr Henry More. Born at Grantham, in Lincolnshire, in 1614, and educated in strict Calvinistic principles, which he abandoned however in later life, More became a student in Christ's Church in 1631. In Christ's Church all his days were spent ; for, though often solicited to accept preferment, he could never be persuaded to leave his thoughts and his books. He was passionately, we might say self-indulgently, fond of contemplation. As he says himself, he made a "paradise" of his own studies and reflections. At times, his biographer tells us, he was swallowed up in rapturous warmths, and was entirely lost in joy and happiness. This genial teacher soon gathered disciples around him, and became the centre of an admiring circle. His writings, although mystical and not very intelligible, appear to have won a considerable popularity with the religious public of the day. This, we should imagine, was far from displeasing to him, as judging from his writings we

should say that there was a considerable vein of quiet vanity in his character. In the introduction to the "Mystery of Godliness," he says that in his earlier studies he had occupied himself with inquiries into the nature of the human soul, "Which I pursued," he says, "chiefly by the guidance of the school of Plato, whose philosophy to this very day I look upon to be more than human in the chief strokes thereof." "A dangerous sickness," he continues, "that made me suspect that the time did near approach of quitting this earthly tabernacle, urged me more carefully to bethink myself what reception I might have in the other world. And, praised be God, such was the conviction of my soul, though then much overrun with melancholy, that my presage concerning my future state was very favourable and comfortable, and my desire was to be gathered to that Body of which Jesus Christ is Head, even he who was crucified at Jerusalem and felt the pangs of death for a propitiation of the sins of the world, who was there represented to me as visible a Prince, and as distinct a Person and Head politic, as any king or potentate upon earth." The result of these sick-bed meditations was, that he resolved to devote his pen more directly than he had hitherto done to the service of his "Head Politic." In the "Mystery of Godliness" this purpose was carried out. In this work the incarnation of our Lord in all its bearings, is reverently discussed and illustrated with many curious and interesting thoughts, derived from philosophy and history. Notwithstanding the Platonic dress in which he loves to array everything, More holds firmly and expounds reverently and lovingly all the great doctrines of Christianity. He protests most energetically against the tendency to spiritualise away the reality of the gospel history. "That the human person of Christ," he says, "is not to be laid aside, is evident from the whole epistle of the author to the Hebrews. For he that there is said to be a high-priest for ever, is that very man who was crucified on the cross at Jerusalem." And again, "I have, with all earnestness of endeavour, and with undeniable clearness of testimony, from reason and Scripture demonstrated the truth and necessity of both Christ within and Christ without." It would appear that he did not altogether relish the phrase "imputative righteousness," but his views on justification did not really differ from those of the other divines of the period; but he was perhaps fonder of laying stress upon this, that "the end of the gospel was to renovate the spirits of men into true and real inherent righteousness and holiness," and he spoke of it as a "great scandal and effectual counter plot against the power of the gospel, the nullifying and despising of moral honesty by those that are great zealots and high pretenders to religion." "For

what an easy thing it is," he exclaims, "for a man to fancy himself an Israelite, and then to circumvent his honest neighbours under the notion of Egyptians." As for the Roman Catholic Church, he considered that the economy of that church "naturally tends to the betraying of souls to eternal destruction," but adds, nevertheless, "not that it is possible for me (who cannot infallibly demonstrate to myself that all that lived under paganism are certainly damned) to imagine that all that have gone under the name of Papists have tumbled down into hell."

The above extracts will give an idea of the spirit of More's speculations, and indicate, with sufficient clearness, the class of modern thinkers with which he and others of the school had most affinity. We are aware that many earnest and conscientious Christians regard with suspicion all endeavours to construct a Christian philosophy as likely to end in unbelief and heresy. We cannot deny that examples can be cited, from ecclesiastical history, which give at least an apparent plausibility to this view. Nor can we say, even for More and his friends, that they never transgressed the limits of legitimate Christian speculation, that they never forgot that there are some questions which have been raised in theology, the decision of which ought to be referred, according to the advice of Erasmus, not to a general council of divines, but to the day of judgment. No man, however, not blinded by prejudice, can look into the works of the Cambridge Platonists without being struck and touched by the genuine piety and simple love of truth by which they are distinguished, while the poetic glow of their style and manner is often very charming. Had we no better plea to offer in their defence, we might, at all events, say that teachers so gentle and genial are a pleasing phenomenon in the dark and troublous times in which they lived,—like

"Moonlight on a troubled sea,
Brightening the storm it cannot calm."

But they are entitled to recognition on other grounds. It has been said most justly of Cudworth by a recent critic, that the thinker who, in the age of Hobbes, enunciated the proposition that the will of God is essentially righteous, that power is only its accident, its attribute, did thereby win a title to canonisation among the moralists of England. And all the writers of the school were earnest assertors of the reality of eternal truth and righteousness. To say that a Christian philosophy is impossible, that all attempts to reconcile the teachings of our faith with the lessons of life and history are mischievous and vain, is to forget that to all true vocations of man there is a place allotted in the service of that faith which is wide as humanity,

for it came from him who knoweth what is in man. It is also to forget many an honoured name in the pages of church history; for, from the time when Justin Martyr wore the philosopher's gown, and witnessed for the Christian's creed, down to the present day, not a few true and able defenders of the faith have spoken in philosophic language. Among such the Platonists of Cambridge deserve no unhonoured place.

The times of the Civil War form a rough episode in the academical history of Cambridge. According to the royalist accounts, the university was loaded with "a whole Iliad of miseries," and we can well believe that Cromwell and his troopers sadly fluttered the timid academical birds in their quiet nests. Mr Carlyle has sketched the situation with grim humour. "Of course," says he, "the academic stillness is much fluttered by the war drum, and many a confused brabble springs up between gown and garrison; college tippets, and, on occasions, still more venerable objects getting torn by the business. The truth is, though Cambridge is not so malignant as Oxford, the surplices at All Hallowtide have still much sway there, and various heads of houses are by no means what one could wish; of whom accordingly Oliver has had, and still occasionally has, to send by instalment, as the cases ripen, a select batch up to Parliament; Rev. Dr this, then also Dr that, who are lodged in the Tower in Ely House in Lambeth or elsewhere in a tragic manner, and pass very troublous years."

In 1643, copies of the Solemn League and Covenant were sent down to Cambridge, and the names of those who took this test, and of those who refused it, were returned to Parliament. In the following year college offices implying trust were restricted to those who had signed the covenant. At a later period, "the engagement" a test of similar import was imposed upon the members of the university. This may be regarded as very hard and oppressive; no doubt from one point of view it was, but it must be apparent that when once the questions between King and Parliament were referred to the wager of battle, neither party could be expected willingly to suffer a place of such importance as Cambridge to be ruled by its enemies. But there was never, we believe, any desire on the part of the Parliament wantonly to interfere with Cambridge and its studies. In the first year of the war, we find Essex issuing a special order to all colonels, lieutenant-colonels, and captains of the Parliamentary forces, warning them "not to offer any damage to the University of Cambridge, or to any of the schools, colleges, halls, libraries, chapels, or other places belonging to the said university." Cambridge afterwards assisted the king with plate and money, which may have

brought upon it somewhat harsher treatment, but nothing recorded can justify the lamentations of such writers as Walker. We read, it is true, that on one occasion when a preacher was going in his robes through the streets to deliver a Latin oration in one of the colleges, the troopers followed him and cried, "a Pope, a Pope," and when they came to the chapel and found the sermon was to be in Latin, they exclaimed that preachers ought to preach in English, that all might understand: we are not sure but the preacher's gown got torn, but nothing more serious, and this is the nearest approach to an outrage we can remember as having occurred. When the Civil War was over, and the supreme power was placed in the strong hand of the Protector, Cambridge, as well as other places, had occasionally to take very distinct orders from the "Col. Cromwell" it had known of old. We find him writing on one occasion to the Vice-Chancellor and Senate of the University as follows:—"Whereas we are informed that you cannot by the statutes, and according to the customs of the university, admit any to the degree of bachelor of music unless he had some years before been admitted in a college; and whereas we are also certified that Benjamin Rogers hath attained to eminence and skill in that faculty, we, willing to give all encouragement to the studies and abilities of men in that or any other ingenuous faculty, have thought fit to declare our will and pleasure by these our letters, that, notwithstanding your statutes and customs, you cause Benjamin Rogers to be admitted and created bachelor in music in some one or more of your congregations assembled in that our university, he paying such dues as are belonging to that degree, and giving some proof of his accomplishments and skill in music."

That academical use and wont should have to give way to plain common sense, was doubtless felt to be a great hardship by many of Cambridge's doctors; but we live in times when men are beginning to whisper that more than one ancient and venerable institution might be rendered considerably less useless were common sense once more armed with sovereign power.

Mr Mullinger, fair and candid as he usually is, evidently cannot contemplate with any patience the idea of Puritans ruling in his beloved Cambridge. Little interest, he says, can be felt in a period so abnormal, and he quotes with approval Lord Macaulay's contemptuous description of university studies during these times.* Unfortunately our information regard-

* "The muses were banished from their own favourite haunts, Cambridge and Oxford; Cowley, Crashaw, and Cleveland, were ejected from their fellow-

ing the state of the university during this period is extremely scanty ; but the impression conveyed by Lord Macaulay and other writers, that the ordinary studies were altogether discontinued, appears to be erroneous. Oliver Heywood was a student of Trinity at this time, and it is from his account of himself that this impression appears to have been derived. "My time and strength," says he, "were more employed in practical divinity ; and experimental truths were more vital and vivical to my soul. I preferred Perkins, Bolton, Preston, Sibbes, far above Aristotle, Plato, Magirus, and Wendeton, though I despise no laborious authors in these subservient subjects." This extract certainly informs us that Oliver Heywood loved to spend his time over books of experimental divinity rather than over the classics, but the inference is by no means necessary that either he or his fellow students wholly neglected secular studies. We know that through the whole of the period Duport was lecturing on the classics.

The Puritans, as was to be anticipated, took especial care to provide what they judged to be sound and faithful religious teaching for the students. The Scriptures were expounded daily, sometimes by the master, sometimes by the fellows in the college chapels. Mr Samuel Hammond, who preached in the pulpit of St Giles, appears to have exercised a wide and salutary influence. He preached, we are told, "with that pious zeal, pungency, and Christian experience, that from all parts of the town, and from the most distant villages, his useful ministry was attended on, and it was crowned with the conversion of some scores, I might have said hundreds of scholars." Heywood says of Hammond's preaching : "I usually met with a suitable searching word, and one that warmed my heart." There is surely nothing in all this to justify the assertion that the Puritans made Cambridge a very Münster. What the universities might have become under Puritan rule it may seem vain now to conjecture. Their rule lasted too short a time to allow their system to have a trial ; but those who imagine that university studies must necessarily languish under the guidance of men holding such views as the Puritans, may be referred to the case of the university of Halle, which, founded under the auspices of the Pietists of Germany, became in a short time one of the most renowned seminaries of learning in the north of Europe. Opportunity was not granted, however, to the Puritans either to fail or to succeed in the experiment which they had commenced. The Restoration brought

ships. The young candidate for academical honours was no longer required to write Ovidian epistles or Virgilian pastorals, but was strictly interrogated by a synod of lowering supralapsarians as to the day and hour when he experienced the new birth."—*Macaulay's History of England.*

back Charles II., and the rule of the Puritans came to an end.

Mr Mullinger has devoted much less space to the latter part of the century, than to the more picturesque period which went before. It is, however, a time full of interest for the historian, and contained in it seeds of future change. Cambridge had not a little to boast of in this time likewise. Barrow was lecturing on Mathematics, and exhorting the students with all the force of his manly eloquence to pursue with diligence the "divine mathesis." Newton was bringing honour to his *alma mater* by his splendid discoveries, and exciting a wide spread interest in pursuits which had formerly been almost unknown in universities. Towards the close of the century, the students of Cambridge, as well as every one else, were beginning to read the works of a certain Mr John Locke, who wrote of the human understanding, of the nature of government, and of toleration, in a manner which would probably have been equally distasteful to Puritan, Platonist, and High Churchman, but from which they all might have learned something. The philosophy of Locke, and the theology of Paley, which was its offspring, are by no means the noblest and highest efforts of the human mind; and it is not to the century which was ruled by their spirit that we look for the saints and heroes of European history. Nevertheless, we do owe to that period, and to its philosophy, certain homely and useful services, to which it is unjust to deny due acknowledgment. Yet we do not wonder that it is with a certain feeling of regret, that men come to the conclusion that the spread, if not the origin, of just views on the nature of government and the duty of toleration, is to be traced in no small measure to the decay of ancient loyalty and the cooling of religious zeal.

ART. III.—*The Present and Future Position of the Church of England.**

BY A PRESBYTER OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

First Report of the Commissioners Appointed to Inquire into the Rubrics, Orders, and Directions for Regulating the Course and Conduct of Public Worship, &c., according to the Use of the United Church of England

* We give this communication as it stands without pronouncing any opinion on the sentiments or the suggestions which it contains.—ED.

and Ireland: with Minutes of Evidence and Appendices. Presented to both Houses of Parliament by command of Her Majesty. London; Printed by Geo. Edw. Eyre & W. Spottiswoode, 1867. Second Report of the same. London. 1868.

THE attention of religious men in Great Britain and elsewhere is much occupied with the question, What is to be the future of the Church of England? What is to be the result of the remarkable movement which is now progressing within her pale? Is it destined to terminate in a secession to Rome, or in a secession to the ranks of the Nonconformists? Or will Ritualist and Evangelical, those who are loudest in their assertion of priestly authority, and those who deny it altogether, continue to work as at present within the National Church of England.

It might, indeed, be gravely asked, In what sense the name of Church can be correctly applied to a body which contains within it such diverse elements as those found in the Church of England? According to the XIXth Article, a Church is defined to be "a congregation of faithful men, in which the pure Word of God is preached, and the Sacraments be duly ministered according to Christ's ordinance," &c. Can the Bishops of Salisbury and Carlisle, the Bishops of Natal and Oxford, Dr Rowland Williams and Archdeacon Denison, Dr Pusey and Mr Ryle, Mr Orby Shipley and Lord S. G. Osborne, be regarded in any intelligible sense as alike preachers of "the pure Word of God," and faithful dispensers of the Sacraments? It is a matter of notoriety that these men condemn one another as strongly as they do the members of other opposing Churches. On what principle, then, of reason or of common sense, should men be permitted to nestle safely under the shadow of the Church of England, enjoying in common her "loaves and fishes" (which is nearly all that they have in common), while Methodists, Presbyterians, Independents, &c., who are not a whit more separated in opinion from the members of the Established Church, than the above named individuals are from one another, are excluded from all her privileges and emoluments?

There are several courses open for adoption with respect to the Church, in the present state of affairs, all of which are, however, fraught with dangers, though of a very different kind.

1. The present *status quo* of the Church may be maintained. Low Churchmen, Broad Churchmen, and High Churchmen may each be permitted to develope, each in their own way, subject always as they are at present to the necessity of keeping within certain not well-ascertained legal bounds. The legal decisions which, after a protracted struggle, will be given in the case of the Ritualistic prosecutions, will

probably restrain some of the more obnoxious outward features of the movement, but are pretty certain not to afford a decided victory to either side. Evangelical ministers are likely to be restrained by counter-prosecutions in the exercise of their long-permitted liberty in the matter of divers inconvenient rubrics and canons, while on the other hand excesses of ritual may be curtailed, although the doctrines of the Ritualists will be suffered, if thinly veiled ever, to be taught without let or hindrance.

The advantages to be gained from such a course of proceeding are clear. No secession from the church, except in a few individual instances, will take place. All will be permitted quietly to eat their own bread, and enjoy such a share of Church patronage as they can severally contrive to secure. Bishops, in a year or two, will triumphantly exclaim in their charges that the crisis of Ritualism has passed away and left the Church uninjured, as the wave of Tractarianism is said by some to have harmlessly swept over it. They may urge upon all parties, as some of them do now, the duty of moderation, and of regarding each other with brotherly affection and esteem. Thus wolf and lamb may lie down again in the same fold, and "our beloved church" be served alike by those who glory in the name of "parish priests," and those who prefer the more scriptural appellation of "ministers." The "thirty-nine stripes" may be gently laid upon the back of "catholic priests," and the rubrics and canons mildly restrain evangelical pastors.

2. Or the present *status quo* may be "slightly" altered. Altered rubrics, and revised, and, therefore, binding canons, may restrain alike Ritualist and Evangelical. The one may be forced to lay aside his parti-coloured clothing, and conform to the Rubrics and the Rubrics only. The *Directorium Anglicanum* may be laid aside on the shelf, and labelled, "for internal use only"; processions with banners and crosses may be inhibited, unless when some "reverend Father in God" may happen to be present, and give his sanction; confessions may be relegated to the priest's parlour or study, instead of being performed at the rails of the "holy altar," or in some "box" in the consecrated edifice. The evangelical minister may on his part be forced to give up his conventicle-like prayer-meetings, if he have such, and to read daily prayers and the Apocryphal lessons in due course, to notify duly the people of the saints' days and fast days, to go through verbatim the whole form for the celebration of matrimony, to use the Service for the visitation of the sick, with its popish form of absolution, and to instruct the young of his flock more diligently in the Church Catechism, and less diligently in the Bible.

A compromise of this kind will no doubt be acceptable to

many. There are bishops who have already signified their approval of it, who would desire to see Ritualist and Evangelical equally humbled. If the one must not be permitted to play at Popery, the other must not approach Puritanism. If the one must not near the rock of Rome, the other must not steer his craft towards the dangerous whirlpool of Geneva. Both parties may be satisfied if both are punished alike, and neither gets off scot free. As for the Broad Churchman, he does not care for either, if only he be left the liberty of unsettling the minds of his congregation. He for his part might not be disinclined to submit willingly to some such yoke of Erastianism as that which is borne by some Continental Churches, where liberty of speech and freedom in doctrinal matters is almost perfect, but where liberty of action is unknown ; where both the Rationalist and the Orthodox must use the same "form of words," and sing from the same "Gesangbuch," but may almost believe or disbelieve at will the doctrine of the Trinity, and the inspiration of the Bible.

3. A bolder course might be adopted. High Churchmen might resolve to expel Evangelicals, or Evangelicals High Churchmen. It would be only politic to let Broad Churchmen alone for a while. The great contest at present is that between the High and the Low Church parties. Important as are the questions raised by Broad Churchmen, they are in general not so pressing, and some of them are not yet ripe for definite solution. But if the High Church doctrine of baptism or the Lord's Supper were recognised to be that of the Church, Evangelicals would have to secede, while, if the views held by the Evangelical party were to be authoritatively adopted, High Churchmen would have to withdraw from its communion. The contest might, too, be fought out on the question whether the clergy are to be regarded as sacrificing priests, or as preachers of the Word of God. If even the Ritualists, as a body, were forced to secede, alterations in the Prayer Book, in a Protestant sense, would be sure to follow ; or if the bolder and more active part of the evangelical party were forced into secession, High Church views would soon attain such a development as would drive out the other members of the party.

This would be, indeed, the most honest course for either the Evangelicals on the one side, or the High Churchmen on the other, to pursue. Of course, the danger would be that a secession must follow on the one side or the other, and a secession of any considerable dimensions might ultimately lead to the dis-establishment of the Church. Despite this danger, there is scarcely any doubt but that such a secession would be the final result of the present struggle, if the Church of England had a similar representative Assembly as that which the Church of Scotland pos-

sessed at the date of the Disruption. In such a general Assembly, the strength of each party could be fairly tested, and definite decisions arrived at on the various questions at issue. Whereas in the Church of England, as at present constituted, it is difficult to know, with any degree of certainty, either the relative strength of parties or the general feeling on any one subject, and equally impossible to settle any disputed points of doctrine, or to accomplish any real liturgical reform. The Government understand fully what the result of any action on the part of a representative assembly must be, and therefore will neither allow the Convocations of the Church to proceed to real business, constituted as they are at present, nor will it permit them to reform themselves.

4. There is yet a fourth course of action which may be pursued. The Church may grant more liberty to all parties within its pale. It may, perhaps, be too late effectually to restrain the Ritualists, or to bind up the Evangelicals by more stringent rules. It may be only possible therefore to proceed, by permitting an advance in liberty. The Ritualists might be left free to act as they choose, while the Evangelicals, on their side, should be left equally free to develop in their own way. Inasmuch, indeed, as the Church is Protestant, the outward protest against Rome might perhaps be enforced by the prohibition of Romish vestments on the part of its ministers, and by the continuance of the form of subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles.

But if the Church be broad enough to admit without disguise the parties which are even now to be found in her midst, on what grounds of expediency or justice can she refuse to go a little further, and admit also the great bulk of those Protestant dissenters who are now forced to abide without her pale? The lovers of mediæval theology and ritualism have to resort to forced and unnatural methods of interpretation, to get over the clear protest against their views which is to be found in some ten articles of the present Thirty-Nine. Despite Articles, and Homilies explanatory of the same, there are now hundreds, if not thousands, of the clergy who repudiate for themselves the name of Protestants. Articles of Faith have not kept them out, while one wretched Act of Parliament, the majority of whose provisions have been repealed, still bars the way into the Establishment against Methodists, Presbyterians, &c.

Surely now, when practically almost all kinds of opinions can be held and preached with impunity by clergymen of the Establishment, when a bill has been passed to render subscription to the Prayer Book a more tolerable yoke than it was formerly, and when, despite the Act of Uniformity, uniformity in

worship is almost as little to be found as unity in opinion, it is time that the question of the repeal of the Act of Uniformity should be discussed.

Of these four courses which are possible for the Church of England to take in the present crisis, it is pretty evident that the choice lies between the second and the fourth, or some approximation towards it. The Church cannot remain as it is, at least for any long time; and if the attempt be made to leave it as it is, public opinion will ere long demand that its endowments be swept away, and its connection with the State severed. Still less is there any hope of a real Church Reform being effected either in a High Church or Low Church direction. It is possible, indeed, for some temporary compromise to be brought about, and the evil day postponed for a little. Some compromise is tolerably certain to be effected, if the Evangelical party has left its "first love" of gospel truth, and, enamoured of the temporalities it holds in possession, seeks only how to retain them. But if Evangelical men determine, as they should, to stand up for their present liberty, and are wise enough in their generation to refuse to part with one iota of their present freedom, even for the purpose of gaining a questionable victory over their present foe, then either evangelical men will be ultimately driven to secede in a body and form a free church, after the example of their Scottish brethren, or the Church must take a step in advance towards becoming the National Church of England, in the sense in which Mr Wilson has advocated it should be, in his well-known contribution to the "Essays and Reviews."

Although the present position is far from satisfactory to Evangelical men, it is doubtful whether the juncture is favourable to the formation of a free church. Independently of the difficulties inherent to such a course at any time, there is, just now, an absence of any great and crying grievance, on account of which Evangelical men should secede. It is, indeed, a scandal that such doings and doctrines as those of the Ritualists should be permitted within the Church, but, after all, the doctrines taught by the Tractarians are substantially identical; and if Archdeacon Denison and Dr Pusey be tolerated within the Establishment, there is no great reason why Mr Orby Shipley and Mr Mackonochie should be expelled. The whole history of the English Church has been marked by a notorious absence of church discipline, except of a kind to be deeply deplored by gospel-loving men; and a secession on account of the mere lack of discipline, would not be likely to win popular favour. Until Evangelical men are hindered in their efforts to spread truth, or cramped in their operations, or until some theological decision is given in opposition to their views, there is no necessity for their secession. As long as they can with a

safe conscience abide in the Establishment, and can make use of their position in it to advance gospel truth, they ought to do so. But, in the present remarkable times, there ought certainly to be some more organisation among them, so that when their liberty is threatened, or their cherished doctrines repudiated, they may know what to do. Men, however, in such an abnormal position, ought certainly to abstain from talking so much of their "beautiful and scriptural church," when, so far as the ministers of that church are concerned, it is undeniable that no small portion of them are opposed to earnest religion, are ignorant of all theology, or are led astray by Tractarian, Ritualistic, or Neologian errors.

The prospects before the Church of England are either disestablishment, which may be accomplished in a few years by the Reformed Parliament, or its reduction to a mere State institution, in the benefits of which all parties and opinions shall equally share. It is rapidly becoming, if it has not become so already, an Augean stable, which it would need a Hercules to purify. The Bishops have but little power, and it is questionable whether it would not be better if they had even less. Now they can only crush the weak, and not overthrow the strong. Curates can be forced to knuckle under, but Rectors may defy attack, especially if they have a good purse themselves, or wealthy friends. One of the worst features too, of the times is, that the curates are generally left to themselves in any difficulty, while in the case of rectors and incumbents the truth of the saying is manifest, "the rich have many friends."

No revolution would be required to render the Church essentially National in the sense indicated, and its members completely free. If Nonconformists would combine with Evangelicals, the Act of Uniformity (or what remains of it), which was passed against the former, would easily be repealed. The Prayer Book might remain then as it is, but its use would be left optional, as it ought to have been left from the very beginning. Nor would it really lose by being left so, as the bitterness against the use of forms of prayer has well nigh died away. Nay, the public service of the sanctuary would be the gainer, as the services would be shorter, more hearty, and less constrained; while with small, slight modifications, the Common Prayer Book would be certain to retain its hold on the affections of the people, all the firmer as it would be without compulsion.

The parochial system of the Church has no doubt its advantages, but has peculiar evils of its own. Its most intolerable feature is, that it enables a clergyman to keep out of his parish, not Dissenters, who may be as troublesome as they like, but his brother clergymen. Through its baneful restrictions, it not

unfrequently happens that a man able for a great deal of work is tied down to a small parish, his energies being allowed to dry up and wither, while some lazy cumberer of an adjoining parish will neither work his parish himself, nor permit his brother to help him. An Evangelical is obliged to suffer his neighbour clergyman to preach Ritualism or Neologianism, while he must not stir beyond his own fence for the extension of the gospel, or for the driving away of false doctrine. Why should not every clergyman be free? The temporalities of each beneficed clergyman should indeed be guarded from invasion, and the Church edifice remain in each incumbent's undisputed possession, but no man should have power to monopolise the teaching of a parish, and to hinder earnest men from entering in. Truth does not need such poor defences; every man should be free to spread his opinions as widely as possible, provided he uses only moral persuasion.

If the Church is to be kept up by the State as a kind of moral police, and if the rights of property have so complicated its position, that even its disendowment would be no easy task, why should not full freedom of action be conceded to all parties within its limits? We do not see why livings should not be given to Presbyterians and others, willing to accept them, as well as to Episcopalians. The will of the patron, in case of any difference of opinion between him and the people, forasmuch as the right of property is vested in him, might perhaps be allowed to prevail, but then the people should have the full right to erect any edifice, by their voluntary exertions, they may choose, and to support any minister they might prefer. The doctrinal basis of the church would be, as at present, the thirty-nine Articles, with all the latitude allowed by the law courts as to their interpretation.

The present condition of the Church is certainly an abnormal one. She possesses no proper representation, nothing worthy of the name of a synod, no power to restrain heresies from arising in her midst. Her bishops are appointed by the State, and must, whether liked or disliked, sound or unsound, be accepted by their clergy. The Church can do nothing in her corporate character without the State, and the State will permit her to do nothing. The object of statesmen is naturally to keep all things as quiet as they can, and accordingly men of no particular views, of little earnestness, good-natured easy-going men, with some talent for administration, are just those which most frequently rise to dignity within her. That some men of a different stamp are to be met with is rather in spite of the present system than by virtue of it. Church courts will not condemn, and rightly too, any one as guilty of heresy unless it be of the most palpable and glaring kind, and hence almost any

heresy may be held within the Church, if the heretic be only wise enough in his generation to keep within moderate bounds, and to conceal his heresy with a slight varnish of orthodox phraseology. This state of things being so, the question is, whether it is better that matters should continue as they are, or that all parties should be permitted honestly to avow their individual convictions, and to fully carry out their principles, and trust to the majesty of truth ultimately prevailing in the contest.

If there was any possibility of the battle being fairly fought out in some General Assembly or Church synod, and of heretics being ultimately driven out from the Church, we would be in favour of doing so. But the State will never permit one party in the Church to gain a decided victory over the other, nor will such clear decisions be given on the controversies respecting the sacraments, or on the authority of the minister, as will exclude semi-Romanisers from exercising their ministry in the Church of England. Therefore, if we must tolerate men in our midst as fellow-ministers, and even as bishops, with whose creed we utterly disagree, and whom we regard as equally guilty of heresy as the disturbers of the Church's peace in olden times, why not let all parties carry out their views as they choose, the present trammels which fetter free evangelical action being broken at the same time? The bishops might continue to draw their salaries, to administer the business of their respective dioceses, and to act as State-officials; but, within certain well marked-out limits, the clergy might be left free to preach and act according to their honest convictions, and by accepting office in the Church, be bound only to perform regularly divine service on Sundays in their churches, and to reside in their parishes. Of course such persons would be bound to adhere to the Articles, as expounded by the law courts, and liable to deposition if they preached contrary doctrine. The bishops would not fail to exert a strong moral influence over their clergy, though deprived of the power of hindering their action in religious matters. This would be at least an honest course to pursue. Ministers who desired to unite themselves with some other Church organisation, while performing their appointed duties in the National Church, should be left free to do so, while retaining their State endowments. Such persons should, of course, have a certain relation to their bishop as an official of the State, but should have the utmost freedom possible in other respects.

Were such a scheme to be adopted, the Evangelical party would be in every way the gainers. Their pristine energy would be stirred up, and they would throw themselves into the work of enlightening the masses, unembarrassed by fewer difficulties

than they now experience. But as long as they regard their present church as ideally perfect, on account of the beauty of its Liturgy and the Scriptural character of its Articles, and continue to shut their eyes to its gigantic practical abuses, and the toleration of every false doctrine in its midst, so long must they remain, as they are, "cribbed, cabined, and confined." Truth, immortal truth, would win the day, if men would energise for truth and the gospel alone, and not for the mere scaffolding of Churchmanship.

A danger is ahead for the Evangelical party, one which even now they ought to beware of. It is that of having additional manacles placed on them. The Royal Commissioners, in their first two reports, have pronounced against the Ritualistic innovations, either unanimously, as in the first instance, or by a large majority, as in the second. So far, so good. But who expected otherwise, even from an assembly of moderate High Churchmen? But what will be contained in the next part of the Commissioners' report, which has to deal with the rubrics and the tables of proper lessons? Is it unlikely that while certain rubrics and lessons may be altered, the whole may be made more binding on the clergy than formerly, and that some additional power may be recommended to be given into the hands of the bishops?

There is no doubt that Evangelical men have from time to time taken liberties with the rubrics and canons, liberties which custom permits them now to avail themselves of without let or hindrance. Who now gives out notice of the holy-days or fasting days to be observed in each week? Who is there but considers himself free to give notice of missionary meetings, Bible meetings, Bible classes, and prayer meetings, without troubling himself to consult his bishop on the subject? How many clergymen administer the Lord's Supper by repeating the formulas to railsful of communicants, instead of each individual? How few trouble themselves with the inquiry whether all their communicants are confirmed, or if not, are willing to be so? How many, on the contrary, rejoice to see members of other denominations partakers at the Lord's table? But each and all of these practices are unrubrical. Nay, the canon goes further, and instructs the minister not to admit strangers to the communion, but to "remit such home to their own parish churches

* This may appear a matter of slight moment whichever way it may be settled, but to some minds it is not so. When a clergyman has to administer the Lord's Supper to the moderate number say of 50 communicants, it is very difficult for many to repeat the same formularies over 200 times, in the space of 30 or 45 minutes, without feeling not only fatigue, but actually pronouncing solemn words in a careless and heartless manner.

and ministers, there to receive the communion with the rest of their neighbours"—(Canon 28).

Other points can be easily mentioned—such as the reading of the offertory, and the use of the prayer for the Church Militant on every occasion, and the consequent lengthening of the service and shortening of the time for the more important duty of the minister, namely, the exposition of God's word. Many earnest ministers of the Church are in the habit of having prayer meetings, which are sometimes partly conducted by laymen, or by members of other churches. It is very questionable whether all such meetings do not come under the head of "conventicles," and whether they might not be condemned by a rigorous exposition of Church law.

Many of the clergy never read the whole of the marriage service, the wording of which, indeed, is too plain and unfastidious for modern taste in general. But in this they unquestionably violate both the rubric and the Act of Uniformity, though custom may now, perhaps, secure them from all penalties. Instead of curtailing this liberty, we would prefer to see the same liberty taken with both the Baptismal and Burial Services.

Some, also, of the Evangelical clergy are wont occasionally to use extempore prayer before their sermons—a very laudable custom, indeed, as we think, and one the principle of which is approved of in the 55th canon. But there are many inclined even to forbid this small liberty; and, as practised, there is little doubt that it is unrubrical, though the using of a collect as a prayer before the sermon is equally so.

Nay, more, private meetings of ministers to consult together as to the course to be taken by them in any emergency are forbidden by Canon 73, and it may be questioned whether that Canon could not be applied to forbid many committee meetings held for divers purposes.

We do not care to refer to several Canons which are obsolete and absurd, as those respecting the exorcism of devils, the cut of ecclesiastical coats, or the "night caps" ecclesiastical persons are permitted to wear. Our object is only to indicate some points in which clergymen of the Church of England have set at nought the regulations of their Church, and, laudably, as we think, have broken through her ordinances. One point only we shall in conclusion refer to, and that is the reading of the Apocryphal Lessons in the Church. We know not what the Royal Commissioners may recommend on this head, but meanwhile we have to consider matters as they are, not as they may be.

Evangelical men, as a rule, have passed over these lessons, and substituted in their room others from Canonical Scripture.

The "admonition to all ministers ecclesiastical" prefixed to the second volume of the "Homilies" may be pleaded in defence of their conduct; whether legally or not, we do not now inquire.

But what we do ask is this, Whether the successors of Newton, Romaine, and Simeon, will see with complacency these liberties which we have recounted curtailed? whether, in order to oblige Ritualists to dress a little less like Roman priests while they still are permitted to preach Popish doctrine, men who love the gospel and desire liberty to set forth Christ and his salvation, and to work freely for the conversion of souls, will allow themselves to be restricted in their liberties? whether, in order to drive the stag from the pasture, they will permit bishops and convocation to bridle, saddle, and ride them.

It has not, indeed, come to this in England, but it is not unlikely it will soon. World-loving men may be indignant if Evangelicals will not submit to a compromise, which may put an end to the outward extravagances of Ritualism, while it deprives preachers of the gospel of their liberty. Moderate men, as they are called, may admire mutual concession, and may be willing to leave us the liberty of preaching, if we only resign the liberty of practising. But if any unworthy compromise be suggested and carried into effect, we hope to see a noble secession of Evangelical men from the ranks of the Church, a secession large in numbers, and as earnest, we trust, in feeling, as was that of the brave Puritans of old. Regardless of any fears of disestablishment, or any dread of secession, we trust the cry of the Evangelicals will be, We will compromise none of our liberties, and we will abate none of our freedom of action, while we strive earnestly to drive from the Church the men who desire peace with Rome, and wish to lead us back to the darkness of the middle ages.

ART. IV.—*The Great St Bernard Hospice.*

THERE is no episode in continental travel more interesting at the time, and more suggestive of pleasing memories afterwards, than a visit to the Great St Bernard Hospice. It does one moral as well as physical good. The imagination is stimulated by the associations of the place; and the heart filled with the feverish unrest and love of excitement, so characteristic of the present age, is rebuked and calmed by the loneliness and monotony of the life led there. Every one has heard of its dogs and monks, and its travellers rescued from

the snow storms. Pictures of it used to excite our wonder in the days of childhood ; descriptions of it in almost every Swiss tourist's book have interested us in maturer years ; while not a few of us have made a pilgrimage to the spot, and thus given to the romantic dreams and fancies of early life a local habitation and a name. Still, trite and worn-out as the subject may appear, it is impossible by any amount of familiarity to divest it of its undying charm ; and those who have visited the scene, so far from their interest in it being exhausted, have only been made more enthusiastic in its favour, and more anxious to compare or contrast their own experience with that of every new traveller who writes upon it. For these reasons we offer no apology for laying the following sketch of the monastery before the readers of the *Evangelical Review*, at a time when the annual migratory instinct is impelling multitudes away from the smoke and roar of cities to the green haunts and the primitive life of nature, and stirring up in the hearts of lonely students, weary of mental labour, longings for the blue lakes of the Highlands, or the gleaming snows of the Alps, to restore the balance between mind and body. Subjects of this kind will now excite an amount of attention which they would not have received amid the pressing cares and duties of the busy season, and will be felt to be in harmony with the mood of men's minds, and with the pursuits in which they are engaged. Especially is such a subject at such a time suitable for the pages of this journal, inasmuch as it rests upon an ecclesiastical basis, and combines in a felicitous manner the studies of the theologian with the adventures and enjoyments of the tourist.

Before proceeding to describe the Hospice itself, with its scenery and historical associations, it is proper to explain the circumstances of its origin. There are three monks of the name of Bernard whose names occupy a high place in the Roman calendar of saints. All of them were celebrated men, and left their mark upon the age in which they lived. St Bernard, abbot of Clairvaux, on the Lake of Geneva, was, during the first half of the twelfth century, the oracle of all Christian Europe. His austere mode of life, inspiring eloquence, boldness of language, and supposed prophetic powers, raised him to a nobler rank than that of any pope or cardinal, and made him by far the most influential ecclesiastic of the middle ages. He was the umpire of princes and bishops, and his voice in the councils of the church was regarded as almost divine. By historians he is regarded with interest as the great apostle of the second crusade ; but a sweeter charm invests his memory as the author of works in which an enthusiastic mysticism blends with an eminently practical aim. Luther says of him, ' If there has ever been a pious monk who feared God, it was

St Bernard, whom also I hold in much higher esteem than all other monks and priests throughout the globe." The monk whose name is imperishably associated with the Alpine Pass and Hospice, must not be confounded with this remarkable man, nor yet with St Bernard of Cluny, the pious author of that exquisite hymn, so common now in our modern collections, "Jerusalem the Golden." Bernard de Menthon had his own claims to the gratitude and admiration of mankind, though they were not so great as those of his more distinguished namesakes. His history displays more romance than is usually found in the calm, uneventful life of a Roman ecclesiastic, and deserves a brief notice in passing. Ibertis in his admirable "*Essai Historique*" informs us, that he was born in the Chateau de Menthon on the Lake of Annecy, about the year 923. His parents were of noble extraction, and possessed extensive estates in Savoy. Being their only child, they were naturally anxious that he should perpetuate the hereditary honours of the family, and for this purpose they planned a match between him and a rich and accomplished heiress who lived in the neighbourhood. Bernard, however, was of a studious and religious temperament, and encouraged by his tutor, had resolved to give himself up to a monastic life. He was therefore for a long time deaf to the entreaties of his parents. In the hope that his resolution would melt away if brought for a while under the immediate spell of Marguerite's beauty, he was induced to pay a visit to the Chateau de Miolans, where she resided; his tutor in the mean time having been dismissed. This ruse seemed at first to be successful; none could come within the influence of the lovely person and accomplished mind of the sweet "Pearl of Savoy" without being fascinated. To see her was to love her; and even Bernard himself began to think that possibly life might be happier as well as nobler spent with her than in the solitude of the cloister. When at intervals he had recourse to his religious studies, he could no longer peruse calmly the ancient books which had formerly been to him a passion. Instead of carrying with him the most abstract meanings of his author, his mind wandered to a thousand indefinite remembrances—the last smile on Marguerite's lip, the last pressure of her hand, the last soft word she uttered. So matters progressed to the satisfaction of all parties, until at last the day was fixed for uniting the fortunes of the two families by the marriage of the young couple. The night before the wedding, Bernard retired to his chamber, not in the blissful state in which most lovers are supposed to spend their last night of single blessedness, but greatly agitated by contending feelings. Doubts of the propriety of the course he was pursuing troubled his mind; and though

inclination strongly whispered that he was doing right, yet conscience kept ever suggesting that he was sacrificing the joys of heaven for the pleasures of earth, that he had put his hand to the plough, and that therefore it was a mortal sin to look back. In this painful state of perplexity, he prayed long and fervently to his patron saint for direction. The chronicle states, that St Nicholas de Myra appeared to him surrounded by a brilliant halo which illumined the whole room, and shewed to him that it was clearly his duty in the circumstances to mortify the flesh and become a monk. Acting upon the ungallant advice of his ghostly visitant, he wrote a letter of farewell to his parents, left them to make what excuses they could to the disappointed bride, and packing up a few necessary things, escaped at midnight through the window, and halted not until he had put the Graian Alps between him and the abode where his spiritual ruin had been so nearly consummated. Crossing over the pass which now bears his name, he came to Aosta in Italy ; and there, having completed his noviciate, he settled down as a parish priest, and became in due season archdeacon of the district. So great was his zeal and piety that the bishop of Aosta associated him with himself in the congenial task of establishing schools and churches in remote localities, and acting generally as an evangelist among the then half-savage, half-heathen, population of the Swiss valleys, so that he soon became known far and wide by the name of "the apostle of the Alps." Owing to his local position, Aosta lying at the termination of the two roads which led over the Pennine and Graian Alps, now known as the Great and Little St Bernard Passes, he had frequent opportunities of becoming acquainted with the dangers to which travellers making use of these routes were exposed, not only from the snow storms and frequent avalanches, but also from the hordes of fierce banditti by which they were infested. He therefore formed, at an early period of his ministry, the noble project of converting these savage marauders by his own personal efforts, and making the passes as safe as possible by the erection of Christian houses of refuge on the wildest and most exposed points. In these efforts he was successful beyond his most sanguine anticipations. The banditti in a short time were induced to abandon their lawless habits, and a comfortable substantial hospice was erected on the summit of each of the passes, and provision made in them for the maintenance of religious worship, and the relief of passing travellers. Both the establishments were committed to the care of monks of the order of St Augustine. Over the principal hospice, St Bernard himself presided for upwards of forty years, and by his unexampled hospitality and sanctity extended its fame over

the whole of Europe. The last act of his life was a journey to Rome, then a most arduous enterprise, undertaken to promote the interests of his beloved institution. Having procured, in a personal interview with Pope Sergius IV., the Papal sanction to his foundation of regular canons, and thus completed his carefully organised scheme, he died at the good old age of eighty-five, at Novara, in the month of June 1008. After his death, he was canonised and admitted to a lofty niche in the Christian Valhalla. His body was buried in the churchyard of the place where he died ; but his skull and arm are deposited as relics under the principal altar of the hospice-chapel, and there regarded with great veneration.

Mr King, in his delightful book "*The Italian Valleys of the Alps*," gives an account of a most touching and romantic incident in the saint's life, while acting as the superior of the Great St Bernard Hospice. One day an aged couple, weary and travel-worn, came to the door and desired to see him. They told him that, attracted by the fame of his piety and wisdom, they had crossed the Graian Alps to ask his advice regarding a sorrowful event, which for many long years had made their life inexpressibly sad to them. They had an only child, a young man of great talent and amiable disposition, upon whom they looked as the prop of their house. They wished him to marry the beautiful and accomplished daughter of a neighbouring nobleman ; and for a while he seemed to consent to the engagement. But when all was ready for the marriage, he suddenly and unaccountably disappeared, and never returned to their home. They sought him far and near, but from that day they had heard no tidings of him. And now their sole desire was to see him once more before they died. They had undertaken this long journey in their old age to ask him what they should do in order to gratify the fond yearning of their hearts. Inexpressibly touched by the sight of his parents' grief, and the ravages which years and one consuming sorrow had wrought on their frames, the superior went hastily out to conceal his emotion. Something in his appearance and manner awoke a slumbering chord in the old couple's bosom ; but they banished the wild thought of recognition as utterly unlikely. In a few minutes the superior returned with tear-wet eyes, and in sobbing words proclaimed himself to be their Bernard, their long lost son. No language could describe the joy of the parents as they clasped him to their bosoms. Proud of his reputation, cheered by his affection, the aged couple spent a few weeks of bliss in the convent, and then returned to their home, rejoicing, like Simeon of old, that the one supreme wish of their life had been crowned at last. "Happy parents," says the chronicler, "doubtless in the home of immor-

talities you now possess that son whom you so long mourned in this land of exile, restored to you in an eternity of happiness, where separations and afflictions are no more." Such are the romantic associations connected with the origin of the hospice.

About the beginning of August, two years ago, we had the pleasure of visiting this celebrated spot in company with two friends. We set out early in the morning in a char-a-banc, or native droskey, drawn by a mule from the "Hotel Grande-Maison-Porte," at Martigny, the Roman Octodurus, and the seat of the ancient bishops of Valais. It is a low, damp, uninteresting place, much infested with a small, black gnat, whose sting is very painful, bred in the marshes of the Rhine. Being a capital centre of excursions to Lago Maggiore over the Simplon, to Aosta and Turin over the St Bernard pass, and to Chamouni by the Tête-Noire, or the Col de Balme, it is exceedingly gay and animated every evening during the summer, owing to the arrival of tourists, and desolate and deserted every morning, owing to their departure. The sun was shining with almost tropical heat, rapidly ripening the walnuts along the avenues of the town, and the grapes hanging in rich profusion on the trellises of the houses; the sky was without a cloud, and everything promised a delightful trip. Passing through a small unsavoury village called Martigny le Bourg, our route crossed the Dranse by a substantial bridge; and at a little distance beyond, a guide-post indicated, to the right the way to Chamouni, and to the left to St Bernard. The entrance by the pass of the Dranse is magnificent, reminding us, though on a grander scale, of the mouth of Glenlyon in Perthshire. Lofty slopes, and precipices richly wooded, approached from both sides so closely that there was hardly room left for the passage of the powerful stream, which, turbid with glacier mud, roared and foamed over enormous blocks of stone. The road, without parapet or railing, overhung the river, and in one place was carried through a tunnel called the *Gallerie Monaye*, upwards of two hundred feet long, cut out of the solid rock. We passed through scattered villages sweetly embosomed among walnut and chesnut trees; but presenting many saddening signs of the poverty and wretchedness of the inhabitants. An unusually large proportion of the people were afflicted with goitres, and here and there we saw sitting on the thresholds of their dirty chalets loathsome cretins, basking in the sun, whose short, shambling figures and unnaturally large round heads and leering faces afflicted us amid the beauty of nature around like a nightmare. The ground was everywhere most carefully cultivated. Every particle of soil among the rocks, however scanty or steep, was terraced up with walls, and made to yield grass, corn, or potatoes.

High up on the brink of precipices that seemed almost inaccessible, bright green spots indicated the laborious care of the peasantry ; and to these, as soon as the winter snows disappeared, sheep were carried up every year, one by one on men's backs, and left there till the end of summer, when they were carried down, considerably fattened, in the same picturesque fashion. The lower meadows by the road side were exceedingly beautiful, of the most vivid green, covered with myriads of purple crocuses and scarlet vetches, and murmurous with the hum of innumerable grasshoppers. Gay butterflies, and insects of golden and crimson hues, never seen in this country, flitted past in the warm sunshine ; and the fragrance of the Arolla pines filled all the air with a highly stimulating aromatic balm. As it was the festal day of the "Assumption of the Virgin," one of the grandest fetes of the Roman Catholic Church, groups of peasants,—the men dressed in the brown cotton blouses peculiar to the district, and the women wearing a curious head-dress consisting of a broad tinselled ribbon plaited and set on edge round a cap, each carrying her prayer-book in her hand, wrapped in a white pocket handkerchief,—passed us on their way to the chapel at Martigny. On all sides we noticed exceedingly distinct traces of two great natural phenomena which had overwhelmed the district, separated from each other by thousands of years. Almost every exposed rock was polished and striated by ancient glaciers ; and the granite boulders, which they had brought down with them, were seen perched upon the schist and limestone precipices hundreds of feet above the river. The whole valley from St Bernard to Martigny, with its tributary glens, must have been the channel of a vast system of glaciers descending from the crest of the Pennine Alps during the glacial epoch, when all the glaciers of Europe and Asia were far more extensive than they are now. The other phenomenon to which allusion has been made, was also caused by glacier action, but of a different kind. In one of the narrow side gorges of the valley, called the Val de Bagne, there is a glacier known as the Glacier de Getroz, which hangs suspended over a cliff five hundred feet high. The end of this glacier is continually breaking off, and falling over the precipice into the bottom of the gorge, where the fragments of ice accumulate and form enormous heaps. In the year 1818 these fallen masses had been piled up to an unparalleled extent, and choked up the narrow, vault-like outlet of the gorge. Behind this icy dam the water of the east branch of the Dranse increased, until at length a lake was formed, nearly a mile long, a quarter of a mile wide, and about two hundred feet deep. The inhabitants of the valley watched anxiously the gradual rise of the waters

knowing that when the warm season should come the icy bank would melt, and the reservoir be at once discharged. Many of them fled in the spring, with their goods and cattle, to the higher pasturages. A tunnel, seven hundred feet long, was cut into the ice, which gradually let off a considerable part of the water without any damage. But a hot June sun and the warmth of the water so gnawed into the ice that on the afternoon of the 16th of the month the barrier burst all at once, and a prodigious mass of water, upwards of five hundred and thirty millions of cubic feet, rushed down the valley with fearful fury, carrying everything before it, and marking its course all the way to the lake of Geneva, fifty miles distant, with gigantic ruins. Many lives were lost; and property to nearly the value of a million sterling was destroyed. To prevent a repetition of this awful calamity, for a similar event occurred in 1595, and the same cause is still in operation, spring water is led by means of a long wooden trough to the dam of ice formed by the falling fragments of the glacier, and the warmth of this water cuts like a saw the ice as soon as deposited, and thus cleaves a passage for the river and prevents its waters from accumulating. The autograph of this tremendous inundation was written, like the mystic "Mene, mene" of Belshazzar's palace, in the huge stones in the bed of the river, and in the gravelly and stony spots far up the sides of the valley, mingling with the relics of ancient glacier action, but easily distinguishable from them.

Passing through Sembranchier, a picturesque village, with the ruins of an enormous castle of the Emperor Sigismund on a hill in its vicinity, and Orsières, situated at the junction of the valleys of Ferret and Entremont, distinguished by a very ancient tower rising high above its curious houses, the road ascended by a series of well-executed zig-zags through a rich and highly-cultivated country to Liddes. Deep down among wild rocks the Dranse pursued its turbulent course unseen, revealing its presence only by an all-pervading murmur in the air. The view extended over an undulating upland landscape of green fields, diversified by wooden frames for drying the corn, somewhat like the curious structures for drying hay to be seen on Norwegian mountain farms. The huge summit of Mont Velan, 12,000 feet high, formed the most conspicuous object on the horizon before us, its dark rocks contrasting finely with its dazzling snows and the rich fields of deep blue sky above it. A cool breeze blew down upon us from the snowy heights, and was inexpressibly refreshing after the stifling heat of the valley. About four o'clock in the afternoon we came to a strange old village, called St Pierre,—the last on the route,—situated on a kind of plateau about 5,000 feet above the level of the sea. It was a very

dirty, miserable place ; and we were victimised by the inn-keeper of the Hotel au Dejeuner de Napoleon, having been charged fifteen francs for a blue scraggy chicken, not much larger than a sparrow, a plate of potatoes fried in rancid grease, and a bottle of Beaujolais wine as sour as vinegar. A remarkably quaint old church, built in the tenth century, still exists in the village. A tablet, with a Latin inscription by Bishop Hugo of Geneva, the founder of the church, commemorates a victory obtained by the inhabitants over the Saraceus, who had ravaged the district with fire and sword. A Roman mile-stone is also built into the wall of the enclosure near the tower. In modern times the place is chiefly interesting as being one of the resting-places of Napoleon in his passage over the Alps, and the birth-place of his famous guide. A little beyond it there is a deep gorge with a splendid, full-bodied waterfall, which we visited. The sides of the pools and the sloping banks were fringed with clusters of tall monkshood, whose blue flowers mingled with the snowy foam of the water. Across the gorge, a frail bridge, with an arched gateway, constructed by Charlemagne, gave access to the main road, which led through the forest of St Pierre in the Défilé de Charreire, and was cut in many places out of the solid rock. Below us, at the foot of perpendicular precipices several hundred feet in depth, the Dranse, still a powerful stream, formed innumerable foaming cascades. There was no wall or abutment to protect us. The off-hand wheel of the conveyance was always within a foot of the edge. We were sitting on the side nearest the precipice, and often could have easily let fall a stone from our hand right down into the river, nearly a thousand feet below. The least false movement on the part of the driver would inevitably have hurled us over to destruction. And yet we went safely and pleasantly along at full speed, our hearts now and then, when we came to a more trying place than usual, perhaps a little higher than their normal position. It was in this defile of Charreire that Napoleon encountered his most formidable difficulties. The old road was declared by Marescat, chief of the engineers, as "barely passable for artillery." "It is possible ! let us start then !" was the heroic reply of his master. It was a favourite maxim with him that wherever two men could set foot, an army had the means of passing ; and he acted upon this maxim on this occasion. As it was about the end of May, the snows were melting fast, and thus greatly increased the dangers and difficulties of the route. "The artillery carriages were taken to pieces and packed on mules ; the ammunition was also thus transported ; whilst the guns themselves, placed on the trunks of trees hollowed out, were dragged up by main strength,—a hundred soldiers being attached to each cannon,

for which labourious undertaking they received the sum of 1,200 francs. At the Hospice, each soldier partook of the hospitality of the brethren."

In about an hour and a-half we came to a solitary inn, called the Cantine de Proz, kept by a man of the name of Dorset, who is very civil to travellers. No other dwelling was in sight. A number of diminutive cows wandered about on the short smooth turf, bright with the lovely Alpine clover; the sweet tinkling of their bells, combined with the monotonous sighing of the infant Dranse, giving us a lonely and far away feeling, as if we had reached the end of the world. A corner of the Glacier de Menouve, of dazzling whiteness, appeared in sight, far up among stern precipitous rocks, of a peculiarly bald and weather-worn appearance. Above the cantine, a little plain, called the Plan de Proz, about 5,500 feet above the sea, sloped up, seamed in every direction with grey water courses, but gemmed with innumerable brilliant clusters of the snowy gentian. Leaving our conveyance at the inn, and taking with us the mule and the driver as a guide, we set off on foot across the plain, to the entrance of a kind of gorge, called the Defilé de Marengo, which is exceedingly steep and difficult of ascent. A considerable stream, confined within narrow bounds, roars and foams within a few feet of the pathway, so that in wet weather its swollen waters must render the defile impassable. Among the rocks, wherever any particles of soil lodged, rich cushions of moss spread themselves, wild auriculas nestled in the crevices, and large patches of crowberry and blaeberry bushes crept over the boulders. These blaeberry bushes fringed the pathway up to within a short distance of the Hospice; and nowhere in Scotland have we seen the fruit so plentiful or so large and luxurious. Basketfuls could be gathered in a few minutes without diverging more than a yard or two from our course; and yet it seems never to be touched. The sides of the stream were decked with the large woolly leaves and brown flowers of the Alpine Tussilago, which takes the place at this elevation of the common Butter-bur, whose enormous umbrella-like leaves form such a picturesque adornment of lowland rivulets. After an hour's stiff ascent, we came to two ruinous-looking chalets, built of loose stones, one of which served as a place of refuge for cattle, while the other was the old morgue, now used as a shelter-place for travellers, where they wait, if overtaken by storms, till the servants of the monastery come down with a dog to their rescue, which they do every morning when the weather is unusually severe. They bring with them on such occasions wine and provisions to restore the exhausted and half-frozen traveller; and guided by the faithful dogs, who alone know the way,—thirty feet of snow being not

unfrequently accumulated in the worst parts of the pass,—they are all brought safely to the hospitable shelter of the convent. From this point the defile receives the ominous name of the Valley of Death ; and the track is marked by tall, black poles, and here and there by a cross, marking the scene of some tragic event. Within a short distance of the Hospice, an iron cross commemorates the death of one of the monks who perished on that spot by an avalanche in November 1845. Between these grim memorials of those to whom the place had been indeed the valley of the shadow of death, we toiled up the rough and arduous path, panting and perspiring, greatly aided by our alpenstocks. We thought the way would never end. We turned corner after corner of the defile, but still no trace of human habitation. Our knees were about to give way with fatigue, the rarity of the air was making itself known to us in thirst and headache, our pulse had advanced from 60 beats at Martigny to 83 at this elevation, and we would gladly have rested awhile. But the shades of night were falling fast, so the banner with the strange device had still to be unfurled. We had in our own experience during this ascent a more vivid conception than we could otherwise have realised of the feverish longing which the lost wanderer in the snow has for a place of refuge and rest. If we, a mere summer tourist, bent upon reaching the Hospice only to gratify a love of adventure, and to realise a romantic sensation, had such a desire, how much more ardent must be the longing of the poor traveller, overtaken by the dreadful *tourmente*, blinded and benumbed by the furious drift, to whom reaching the Hospice is a matter of life and death. At long last, at the very summit of the pass, we saw the Hospice looming above us, its windows glittering in the setting sun. Fatigue and weariness all forgotten, we eagerly clambered up the remaining part of the ascent, along a paved road overhanging a precipice, and in a few minutes stood beside the open door. At first we could hardly realize the fact that the convent, about which we had read so much, which we had so often seen in pictures and pictured in dreams, was actually before us. It had a very familiar look, appearing exactly as we had imagined. We did not approach it in the orthodox fashion,—exhausted and half-frozen amid the blinding drifts of a snow-storm, and dragged in on a dog's back ! On the contrary, the evening was calm and summer-like ; the surrounding peaks retained the last crimson blush of the exquisitely beautiful *abend-gluhen*, or after-glow of sunset ; the little lake beside the convent mirrored the building on its tranquil bosom ; the snow had retreated from the low grounds, and only lingered on the lesser heights in the form of hardened patches wedged in the shady recesses of the rocks. We could not have seen the place under more

avourable auspices ; and yet, nevertheless, the scene was inexpressibly forlorn and melancholy. There was an air of utter solitude and dreariness about it which we have never seen equalled, and which oppressed us with a nameless sadness. There was no colour in the landscape,—no cheerful green, or warm brown, or shining gold, such as relieves even the most sterile moorland scenery in this country. Everything was grey and cold—the building was grey, the rocks were grey, the lake was grey, the vegetation was grey, the sky was grey ; and, when the evening glow vanished, the lofty peaks around assumed a livid ghastly hue, which even the sparkling of their snowy drapery in the first beams of the moon could not enliven. Not a tree, not a shrub, not even a heather bush, was in sight. It seemed as if Nature, in this remote and elevated region, were dead, and that we were gazing upon its shrouded corpse in a chamber draperied with the garments of woe. It was a solemn, awe-inspiring sight !

The Monastery itself is a remarkably plain building, destitute of all architectural pretensions. It is in fact a huge barn, built entirely for use and not for elegance. It consists of two parts—one fitted up as a chapel, and the other containing the cells of the monks, and rooms for the accommodation of travellers, divided from each other by white-washed wooden partitions. It is built in the strongest manner,—the walls being very thick, and the windows numerous, small, and doubly-glazed, so as most effectually to withstand the fearful storms of winter. There is a small separate building on the other side of the path, called the Hotel de St Louis, which is used as a granary, and as a sleeping-place for beggars and tramps. It also provides a refuge in the case of fire, from which the Hospice has frequently suffered severely, being on two occasions nearly burnt to the ground. Ladies were formerly entertained in this building, as it was deemed out of place to bring them into the Monastery. But these scruples have now been overcome, and ladies are freely admitted to all parts of the place, and allowed to sleep in the ordinary rooms. The monks of the present day have not the same dread of the fair sex which their patron saint is said to have cherished. Indeed, the good fathers are particularly delicate and profuse in their attentions to ladies, giving to them the best places at table, and serving them with the choicest viands. In fact, the company of ladies is one of the best letters of introduction that a party can bring with them ; for though the monks are proverbially kind and attentive to all persons without distinction, and especially considerate, from a sympathetic feeling, towards bachelors, yet if they have a warmer place than another in their hearts it is reserved for lady-travellers ; and who would blame them for it !

The St Bernard Hospice is the highest permanent habitation in Europe, being 8,200 feet above the level of the sea, or nearly twice the height of Ben Nevis. There are, indeed, several chalets in the Alps that are still higher, but they are tenanted only during the three summer months, when the people employ themselves in tending goats and manufacturing cheeses from their milk. About the end of September they are deserted, and the shepherds descend to the valleys. The severity of the climate at the Hospice is so great, that the snow never leaves the level ground for nine months in the year. Snow showers are almost always falling, even in the mildest weather; and there are scarcely three successive days in the whole twelve months free from blinding mists and biting sleet. The mean temperature is 30° Fahr., exactly that of the South Cape of Spitzbergen. In summer it never exceeds 48°, even on the hottest day; and in winter, particularly in February, the thermometer not unfrequently falls 40° below zero,—a degree of cold of which we in this country can form no conception. What greatly increases the severity of the climate, is the fact that the Hospice is situated in a gorge pierced nearly from north-east to south-west in the general direction of the Alps, and consequently in the course of the prevailing winds; so that, even in the height of July, the least breath of the *bise*, or north wind, sweeping over the lofty snow region always brings with it a degree of cold extremely uncomfortable. The effect of this bitter Arctic climate upon the monks, as might be expected, is extremely disastrous. The strongest constitution soon gives way under it. Headaches, pains in the chest and liver, are sadly common. Even the dogs themselves, hardy though they are, soon become rheumatic and die. Seven years is the longest span of their life, and the breed is with the utmost difficulty kept up. All the monks are young men, none of them having the grey hair, and long venerable beard, and feeble stooping gait, which are usually associated with the monastic fraternity. In fact, the intensity of the climate prevents any one from reaching old age. The prior, M. Joseph de l'Eglise, has been longer in the convent than any other monk, having spent there considerably more than the half of his life. But though only forty-six years of age, he looked a withered, pinched old man, suffering constantly and acutely from the disorders of the place, yet bearing his illnesses in patient uncomplaining silence, and going about his work as though nothing were the matter with him. The monks begin their noviciate, which usually lasts about fourteen years, at the age of eighteen; but few of them live to complete it. The first year of residence is the least trying, as the stock of health and energy they have brought with them enables them suc-

cessfully to resist the devitalizing influence of the monotonous life and the severe climate; but every succeeding year they become less and less able to bear the cold and privations, and they go about the convent the ghosts of their former selves, blue and thin and shivering. Before they have succumbed, they go down to the sick establishments in the milder climate of Martigny or Aosta, or they serve as parish priests in the different valleys around. But, in many cases, this remedy comes too late. They perish at their posts, literally starved to death. The annals of the convent contain many sad records of such devotion; and they thrill the heart with sympathy and admiration.

We mounted the stair in front of the door of the Hospice, and entered, preceded by our guide. In the wall of the vestibule we noticed a large black marble tablet, bearing the following inscription in gilt letters: "Napoleoni I. Francorum Imperatori semper augusto Reipublicæ Valesianæ restauratori semper optimo, Ægyptiaco, bis Italico, semper invicto, in monte Jovis et Sempronii semper memorando respublica Valesiæ grata, 2 Dec. 1804." At the top of a short flight of steps, our guide rang a large bell twice, and immediately a door opened, and a polite and gentlemanly monk appeared, dressed in a long black coat with white facings, and with a high dark cap, similarly decorated, upon his head. He welcomed us with much politeness, and, beckoning us to follow him, conducted us through a long vaulted corridor, dimly lighted by a solitary lamp, where the clang of an iron gate shutting behind us, and the sound of our own footsteps on the stone floor, produced a hollow reverberation. He brought us into a narrow room, with one deeply recessed window at the end, containing three beds simply draped with dark crimson curtains, and all the materials for a comfortable toilet. There are about eighty beds for travellers of better condition in the monastery, and accommodation for between two and three hundred persons of all classes at one time. Speedily removing our travel-stains, we rejoined our host in the corridor, who shewed us into the general reception room, where we found lights and a smouldering wood fire upon the hearth. The walls of the room, lined with pine wainscot, were hung with engravings and paintings, the gifts of grateful travellers; while in one corner was a piano, presented by the Prince of Wales shortly after his visit to the Hospice. Two long tables occupied the sides, covered with French newspapers and periodicals, among which we noticed several recent numbers of *Galignani* and the *Illustrated London News*. We went instinctively at once to the fire, but found it monopolised by a party of Italians and Germans, who

shewed no disposition to admit us within the magic circle. We elbowed our way in, however, and had the satisfaction of crouching over the singing logs with the rest, and admiring the beautifully carved marble mantelpiece. One of the monks very considerably came in with an armful of wood and a pair of bellows, and, replenishing the fire, speedily produced a cheerful blaze, which thawed us all into good humour and genial chattiness. We felt the cold exceedingly; the thermometer in one of the windows of the room registering six degrees below the freezing point. At Martigny, in the morning, the thermometer indicated about eighty degrees in the shade; so that in less than twelve hours we had passed from a tropical heat sufficient to blister the skin exposed to it, to an arctic cold capable of benumbing it with frost-bites. The rooms of the convent are heated all the year round, and at what an expense and trouble it may be judged, when the fact is mentioned, that every particle of the fuel consumed is brought on the backs of mules over the Col de Fenetre, a continuous ascent of nine thousand feet, from the convent forest in the valley of Ferret, twelve miles distant. Water, too, boils at this elevation at about 187° Fahr, or twenty-five degrees sooner than the normal point; and in consequence of this it takes *five* hours to cook a piece of meat, which would have taken only three hours to get ready down in the valleys, and a most inordinate quantity of fuel is consumed in the kitchen during the process. The most essential element of life in that terrible climate is yet, sad to say, too rare and precious to be used in sufficient quantity. What would not the poor monks give for a roaring, blazing coal fire, such as cheers in almost limitless measure our homes on the winter nights, when they sit shivering over the dim glimmer of a wood fire carefully doled out in ounces!

Having arrived too late for supper, which is usually served at six, the dinner hour being at noon, an impromptu meal was provided for us and the other travellers who were in the same position. Though hastily got up, the cooking of it would have done credit to the best hotel in Martigny. It consisted of excellent soup, roast chamois, and boiled rice and milk, with prunes. A bottle of very superior red wine, which was said to be a present from the King of Sardinia, was put beside each person; and a small dessert of nuts and dried fruits wound up the entertainment. The Clavandier presided, and by his courteous manners made every one feel perfectly at home. The conversation was carried on exclusively in French, which is the only language spoken by the fathers. Coming in contact during the summer months with travellers from all parts of the world, and devoting the long winter to hard study, in which they are helped by the superior, who is a man of great learning, the

monks are exceedingly intelligent, and well acquainted with the leading events of the day, in which they take a deep interest. Some of them are proficient in music ; others display a taste for natural history ; and they all combine various accomplishments with their special study of theology and the patristic literature. They are also very liberal in their views, having none of the bigotry and intolerance which we usually associate with the monastic order, and which is so conspicuous in the cures of the papal Swiss cantons. A striking example of this was related to us at the time. A week before our arrival, an Episcopalian clergyman, happening to be staying with a party of Englishmen in the Hospice on a Sunday, asked permission of the superior to conduct a religious service with his countrymen in the refectory. This was not only granted with the utmost cordiality, but the chapel itself was offered to him for the purpose, which offer, however, he declined in the same spirit in which it was made, unwilling to trespass to that extent upon their catholicity. Conversing pleasantly on various subjects with our host and the guests around, we did ample justice to the good cheer. Fridays and Saturdays, we understood, were fast days ; but though the brethren fasted, no restriction was put during those days upon the diet of travellers—the table being always simply but amply furnished. The task of purveying for the Hospice, which falls to the Clavandier, is by no means an easy one, when it is considered that upwards of sixteen thousand travellers, with appetites greatly sharpened by the keen air, are entertained every year ; and not a single scrap of anything that can be eaten grows on the St Bernard itself. All the provisions, which must consist of articles that will keep, are brought from Aosta, and stored in the magazines of the convent. During the months of June, July, and August, when the paths are open, about twenty horses and mules are employed every day in carrying in food and fuel for the long winter. The country people also bring up gifts of cheese, butter, and potatoes, in gratitude for the kind services of the monks. Several cows are kept in the convent pastures on the Italian side, and their milk affords a grateful addition to the food of the monks. During winter they have no fresh meat at all, being obliged to subsist upon salt beef and mutton, usually killed and preserved in September ; and what is still worse, they have no vegetables ; all attempts at gardening in the place having proved abortive, so that not unfrequently scurvy is added to their sufferings. After an hour or two's chat around the fire, and a very cursory but most interesting inspection of the pile of visitors' books, which contain many celebrated names, and a great deal that is curious and admirable in the way of comment upon the place, our host bade us all good-night, and we too were very glad to

retire. A bright moon shone in through the curtainless window of our bedroom, and lay in bars on the bare floor. Outside, the view was most romantic, the moonshine investing everything, snowy peaks, jagged rocks, and the bare terraces around, with lights and shadows of the strangest kind. A pale blue sky, spiritual almost in its purity and transparency, in which the stars glimmered with a cold clear splendour, bent over the wild spot; and the loneliness and silence were unlike in their depth and utterness anything we had ever before experienced. Snatching, like Gray's schoolboy, a few minutes of fearful joy from the contemplation of the weird scene, worn-out nature summoned us to bed. There was a perfect pile of blankets and a heavy down quilt above us, under which we lay squeezed like a cheese in a cheese-press, but we utterly failed to get warm. Sleep would not be wooed. We lay and watched the shadows on the floor, and thought of many unutterable things, and wondered at the strange vicissitudes of life which so often place us unexpectedly in situations that were the ideals of our youth. About five o'clock in the morning, just as the grey dawn was stealing in, we were thoroughly roused from a dozing, semi-torpid state, into which we had sunk, by the ringing of the convent-bell for matins; and shortly afterwards the rich tones of an organ, mellowed by the distance, pealed from the chapel with an indescribably romantic effect. We arose and dressed with chattering teeth, and then went out into the raw air. We walked beside the small, desolate-looking lake beside the Hospice, where never fish leaped up, and on which no boat has ever sailed. Being the highest sheet of water in Europe, fed by the melting of the snows, it is frequently frozen all the summer; and when thawed, it lies "like a spot of ink amid the snow." Passing a pillar at the end of the lake, and a curious heraldic stone beside a spring, we had crossed the boundary between Switzerland and Piedmont, and were now in Italy. Climbing up the bare rocks, to a kind of esplanade, near a tall cross inserted in a massive pedestal of chlorite-schist, and bearing the inscription, "Deo Optimo Maximo," which guides the traveller from the Italian side of the pass to the convent, we sat down and surveyed the scene. The snowy dome of Mont Velan filled up the western horizon. On our left, the gorge was shut in by the rugged range of Mont Mort, Mont Chenaletta, and the Pic de Dronaz. Below us, we could see through the writhing mist, glimpses of the green corrie, called "La Vacherie," where the cattle of the Hospice grazed under the care of a few peasants, whose wretched chalets were the only habitations; while beyond, to the southward, rose up a strange Sinai-like group of reddish serrated rocks, entirely destitute of vegetation, with wreaths of dark cloud floating

across their faces, or clinging to their ledges, and greatly increasing their savage gloom. An air of utter desolation and loneliness pervaded the whole scene. No sounds broke the stillness, save such as were wonderfully congenial with the spirit of the place, the sighing of the wind as it ruffled the surface of the lake, the occasional tinkle of the cow bells far below, the deep baying of the St Bernard dogs, or the murmur of a torrent far off that came faint and continuous as music heard in ocean shells. We had ample evidence around—if our dripping nose and icy hands did not convince us—of the extreme severity of the climate. The vegetation was exclusively hyperborean, exactly similar in type to that which flourishes around the grim shores of Baffin's Bay. We had gathered the same species on the summits of the highest Scottish mountains, and afterwards on the Dovrefield in Norway. The reindeer moss of Lapland whitened the ground here and there, interspersed with a sulphur-coloured lichen which grows sparingly on the tops of the Cairngorum range. Large patches of black Tripe de Roche—the lichen which Sir John Franklin and his party in the Polar regions were once, in the absence of all other food, compelled to eat, along with the remains of their old shoes and leather belts—clung to the stones, looking like fragments of charred parchment; while an immense quantity of other well-known Arctic lichens and mosses covered the level surface of each exposed rock, as with a crisp shaggy mantle, that crunched under the foot. There were no tufts of grass, no green thing whatever. Tiny grey saxifrages, covered with white flowers, grew in thick clumps, as if crowding together for warmth, along with brilliant little patches of gentian, whose depth and tenderness of blue were indescribable, and tufts of *Aretias* and *Silenes*, starred with a profusion of the most exquisite rosy flowers, as though the crimson glow of sunset had settled permanently upon them. The Alpine Forget-me-not, only found in this country on the summits of the Breadalbane mountains, cheered us with its bright blue eyes everywhere; while the "Alpine lady's mantle" spread its grey satiny leaves, along with the Arctic willow, the favourite food of the chamois, over the stony knolls, as if in pity for their nakedness. We found a few specimens of the beautiful lilac *Soldanella alpina*, and also several tufts of the glacier *Ranunculus*, on a kind of moraine at the foot of a hardened snow-wreath. The *Ranunculus* was higher up, and grew on the loose debris, without a particle of verdure around it. It seemed like the last effort of expiring nature to fringe the limit of eternal snow with life. Its foliage and flowers had a peculiarly wan and woe-begone look. Its appeal was so sorrowful, as it looked up at us, with its bleached colourless petals, faintly

tinged with a hectic flush, that we could not help sympathising with it, as though it were a sensitive creature. But the flower that touched us most, was our own beloved "Scottish blue-bell." We were surprised and delighted beyond measure to see it hanging its rich peal of bells in myriads from the crevices of the rocks around, swaying with every breeze. It tolled in fairy tones the music of "Home, sweet home." It was like meeting a friend in a far country. It was the old familiar blue-bell, but it was changed in some respects. Its blossom was far larger, and of a deep purple tinge, instead of the clear pale blue colour which it has in this country. It afforded a striking example of the changes which the same plant undergoes when placed in different circumstances. We could see in its altered features modifications to suit a higher altitude and a severer climate. In the Alps, all the plants have blossoms remarkably large in proportion to their foliage, and their colours are unusually intensified, in order that they may get all the advantage of the brief but ardent sunshine, so as to ripen their seed as rapidly as possible. And this unprincipled little blue-bell in the vicinity of the monastery, had exchanged the clear blue of the Scottish Covenanter, for the purple and fine linen of the Romish hierarchy, and was just like many others, animals as well as plants, doing in Rome as they do in Rome! In this desolate, nature-forsaken spot, where an eternal winter reigns, the presence of these beautiful alpine flowers, doing their best to make the place cheery, brought a peculiar indescribable feeling of spring to our heart, reminded us irresistibly of the season which is so sad amid all its beauty and promise—the first trembling out of the dark—the first thrill of life that comes to the waiting earth—and then the first timid peering forth of green on hedge and bank; and like Coleridge's "Ancient Mariner," we said—

"Oh! happy living things! no tongue
Their beauty might declare;
A spring of love gushed from my heart,
And I blessed them unaware."

It is impossible to gaze on the St Bernard pass without feelings of the deepest interest. It stands as a link in the chain that connects ancient and modern history—departed dynasties and systems of religion with modern governments and fresh creeds; and in this part the continuity has never been broken. Bare and bleak as is the spot, it is a palimpsest crowded with relics of different epochs and civilisations, the one covering but not obliterating the other. Every step you take you set your foot upon "some reverend history." Thought, like the electric spark, rapidly traverses the thousand historical

links of the chain of memory. You feel as if in the crowded valley in the vision of Mirza. All the nations of the earth—Druids, Celts, Romans, Saracens, French, Italians—seem to pass in solemn file, a dim and ghostly band, before your fancy's eye. Names that have left an imperishable wake behind them—Cæsar, Charlemagne, Canute, Francis I., Napoleon Bonaparte—have traversed that pass. Europe, Africa, and Asia have poured their wild hordes through that narrow defile. The spot on which the convent is erected was held sacred and oracular from time immemorial. Like the Tarpeian rock and the site of ancient Rome, like the stern solitudes of Sinai and Horeb, it had a *religio loci* and a consecrated shrine from the remotest antiquity. The weird, wild aspect of the place gave it an air of terror, and naturally associated it with the presence of some mysterious supernatural being. On a little piece of level ground near the lake, called the *Place de Jupiter*, on which the ruinous foundations of an ancient Roman temple may still be seen, a rude altar, built of rough blocks of stone, was erected three thousand years ago, and sacrifices offered on it to *Pen* the god of the mountains, from whom the whole great central chain of Switzerland received the name of Pennine Alps. The custom of building cairns on the highest points of our own hills, is supposed to have been derived from the worship of this divinity, which seems at one time to have spread over the whole of Europe. The names of many of the Highland mountains bear significant traces of it. Ben Nevis means "Hill of heaven"; and Ben Ledi signifies "Hill of God," having near the summit some large upright stones, which in all probability formed a shrine of the god Pen, whose Gaelic equivalent, as Beinn or Ben, has been bestowed on every conspicuous summit. Who the primitive people were that first erected the rude altars on the St Bernard pass to their tutelary deity, we know not. They may have been allied to those strange Lacustrines who studded the lakes of Switzerland and Italy with their groups of dwellings, at the time that Abraham was journeying to Canaan, and whose relics, recently discovered, are exciting so much interest among archæologists. They were no doubt Celtic tribes; but as Niebuhr says, "the narrow limits of history embrace only the period of their decline as a nation." The few fragments that are left of their language, like the waves of the ancient ocean, have a mysterious murmur of their own, which we can never clearly understand.

For hundreds of years this unknown people worshipped their god, and held possession of their territories undisturbed; but the day came when they were compelled to yield to a foreign invader, who fabricated his weapons of iron, and wielded them with a stronger arm. Rome had established a universal supre-

macy, and sent its conquering legions over the whole of Europe. The stupendous barrier of the Alps offered no obstruction. Through its passes and valleys, led on by Cæsar Augustus in person, they poured like an irresistible torrent, washing away all traces of the former peoples. They demolished the old Druidic altar on the summit of the St Bernard, and erected on its site a temple dedicated to Jupiter Penninus, while the whole range was called Mons Jovis, a name under the corrupt form of *Mont Joux*, which it retained until comparatively recent times. After this the pass became one of the principal highways from Rome to the rich and fertile territories beyond the Alps. A substantial Roman road, well paved, was constructed with infinite pains and skill over the mountain, the remains of which may still be seen near the plain of Jupiter. It was used for centuries ; and Roman consul and private soldier alike paused at the simple shrine of Jupiter Penninus, and left their offerings there, in gratitude for the protection afforded them. A large number of Roman coins, bronze medals, and fragments of votive brass tablets have been found on this spot, and are now deposited in the small museum of the convent adjoining the refectory. In the fifth century the barbarian hordes of Goths under Alaric, of Huns under Attila, and of Vandals under Genseric, swept over the pass to subdue Italy and take possession of Rome. From that time no event of importance, with the exception of the passage of the Lombards in 547, occurred in connection with this spot, until Bernhard, who is supposed by some to have given his name to the pass, uncle of Charlemagne, marched a large army over it in 773, in his famous expedition against Astolphus, the last Lombard sovereign but one. Charlemagne himself afterwards recrossed it at the head of his victorious troops, after conquering Didier, the last sovereign of Upper Italy. Then came Bernard de Menthon in the year 962, and, abolishing the last remains of pagan worship, founded the Hospice which has received his name, and erected the first Christian altar. After this period, as Mr King informs us, the Saracens ravaged the convent, and destroyed its records by fire, and were in turn attacked and repulsed by the Normans. Humbert "the white-handed," led over the pass an army in 1034, to join Conrad in the conquest of Burgundy ; and a part of the army of Frederic Barbarossa crossed in 1166, under the command of Berthold de Zühlingen. "Pilgrims bound to Rome frequented it, travelling in large caravans for mutual protection from the brigands who infested it after the Saracen invasion ; and we find our own King Canute, himself a pilgrim to the tomb of St Peter's, by his representations to the Pope and the Emperor Adolphus on behalf of his English pilgrim subjects, obtaining

the extirpation of those lawless bands, and the free and safe use of the pass." The present building was erected about the year 1680, its predecessor having been burnt to the ground. It is impossible to enumerate within our narrow limits all the remarkable historical events which are connected with this place, from the February of the year 59, when Cæcina, the Roman general, marched over it with the cohorts recalled from Britain, through a snow storm in February, to the spring of the year 1800, when Napoleon crossed it with an army of 80,000 men and 58 field-pieces on his way to the famous battle field of Marengo. There are few spots in the world that have witnessed so many changes and revolutions—few spots which have been trodden by so many human feet ; and we do not envy the man who can gaze upon the narrow path that skirts the lake from the Hospice calm and unmoved, when he thinks of the myriads of his fellow creatures, from the greatest names in all history, down to the lowest and most obscure, who, age after age, have disturbed the stern silence of these rocks, and who have now all alike gone down into undistinguishable dust. Methinks the history of this little footpath is a commentary upon the nothingness of human pride, more impressive than all that poetry has ever sung or philosophy taught !

A little way beyond the Hospice, on a slightly rising ground, is a low building of one storey, built in the rudest manner, and with the roughest materials. It is covered with a grey-slatted roof ; and in the wall of the gable which fronts you, there is a narrow iron grating, through which the light shines into the interior. You look in, and never till your dying day will you forget the ghastly spectacle that then meets your eye. It haunted us like a dreadful nightmare long afterwards. This is the famous Morgue, or dead-house, of which all the world has heard, and which every one visiting the convent, whose nerves are sufficiently strong, makes a special point of seeing. We could almost have wished, however, that our curiosity had been less keen ; for it is not pleasant to hang up in the gallery of one's memory a picture like that. And yet it does one good to see it. It softens the heart with pity ; it conveys, in a more solemn form than we are accustomed to read it, the lesson of mortality ; and it gives us a better idea than we could otherwise have formed of the dangers and sufferings which have often to be encountered in the winter passage of these mountains, and the noble work which the monks of St Bernard perform. It was indeed a Golgotha, forcibly reminding us of Ezekiel's vision of the valley of dry bones. Skulls, ribs, vertebrae, and other fragments of humanity, with the flesh long ago wasted away from them, blanched by sun and frost, lay here and there in heaps on the floor. As our eye got accus-

tomed to the obscurity of the place, we noticed beyond this mass of miscellaneous bones, separated by a low wall which did not obstruct the view, an extraordinary group of figures. These were the bodies found entire of those who had perished in the winters' snow storms. Some were lying prostrate, others were leaning against the rough wall, the dim, uncertain light imparting to their faces a strange and awful expression of life. Three figures especially attracted and rivetted our attention. In the right-hand corner there was a tall spectre fixed in an upright attitude, with its skeleton arms outstretched, as if supplicating for the aid that never came, and its eyeless sockets glaring with a fearful expression of mortal terror and agony. For years it had stood thus without any perceptible change. In another corner there was a figure kneeling upon the floor, muffled in a thick dark cloak, with a blue worsted cuff on the left wrist. No statue of the Laocoon ever told its tale of suffering more eloquently than did that shrivelled corpse. He was an honest and industrious workman, a native of Martigny. He set out early one December morning from that town, intending to go over into Italy in search of employment. He got safely and comfortably as far as the Cantine de Proz, where he halted all night. Next morning he set out through the defile leading up to the Hospice. The weather was at first favourable, but he had not proceeded far when dark clouds speedily covered the sky from end to end, and the fearful *guxen*, which always rages most violently in the Alpine passes, broke out in all its fury. He had doubtless fought against it with all his energy, but in vain. He was found, not three hundred yards from the convent door, buried among the deep snow, frozen in the attitude in which he still appeared, with his knees bent, and his head thrown back in hopeless exhaustion and despair. But the saddest of all the sad sights of the Morgue is the corpse of a woman lying huddled up at the foot of the last-mentioned figure, dressed in dark rags. In her arms she holds a bundle, which you are told is a baby; and her withered face bends over it with a fond expression which death and decay have not been able to obliterate. The light shines full on her quiet features, which are no more ruffled by earthly pain. You cannot fail to see that she had made every effort to preserve the life of the baby to the last moment, for most of her own scanty clothing is drawn up and wrapt round its tiny form, leaving her own limbs exposed to the blast. Oh! sacred mystery of mother's love, stronger than pain, more enduring than death! But, alas! in vain was its self-sacrificing tenderness here. The weary feet could no longer bear the precious burden over the wild; and sinking in the

the fatal sleep, the snow drifted over them, fold by fold, silent and swift, and the place that knew them once knew them no more for ever : the wind passed over it, and it was gone. They found the hapless pair in the following spring, when the snows had melted away ; and they bore them tenderly and sadly to this last resting-place. No one came to claim them. Where the poor woman came from, what was her name, no one ever knew ; and in this heart-touching pathos of mystery and death, she awaits the coming of that other and brighter spring that shall melt even the chill of the tomb.

It is indeed a strange place that morgue ! All its ghastly tenants perished in the same dreadful way,—the victims of the storm-fiend. Side by side they repose, so cold, so lonely, so forsaken ; with no earth to cover them ; no token of love from those who were nearest and dearest ; no flower to bloom over their dust ; not even one green blade of grass to draw down the sunshine and the dew of heaven to their dark charnel-house. Traveller after traveller from the ends of the earth comes and looks in with shuddering dread through the grating on the pitiable sight, and then goes away, perhaps a sadder and a wiser man. For our own part we could not resist the tender impulse, which moved us to gather a small nosegay of gentians and blue-bells, and throw it in, as an offering of pity to the poor, deserted, and forgotten dead. It is impossible to dig a grave in this spot, for the hard rock comes everywhere to the surface, and but the thinnest sprinkling of mould rests upon it, hardly sufficient to maintain the scanty vegetation. This sterile region refuses even a grave to those who die there ! So cold and dry is the air, that the corpses in the morgue do not decompose in the same way that they do at lower elevations. They wither and collapse into mummies, embalmed by the air, like the dried bodies preserved in the catacombs of Palermo,—and for years they undergo no change,—at last falling to pieces, and strewing the ground with their fragments. Within the last twelve years, no less than sixteen persons have perished in the snow. Some five or six years ago, two of the monks went out with a couple of servants to search for a man who was supposed to have lost himself in the mountains. They were scarcely fifty paces away from the Hospice, when an immense avalanche fell from the side of Mont Chenaletta, and buried the whole party under eighteen feet of snow. The dreadful catastrophe was seen from the convent door, but the monks were utterly powerless to render help. When rescued, the party were all dead. The number of accidents on the St Bernard

pass has greatly diminished of late years; and now the services of the monks in winter are principally required to nurse poor travellers exhausted by the difficulties of the ascent, or who have been frost-bitten. Returning from our morning walk, we saw the famous *marons*, or St Bernard dogs, playing about the convent door. There were five of them, massively built creatures, of a brown colour,—very like Newfoundland dogs, only larger and more powerful. The stock is supposed to have come originally from the Pyrenees. The services they have rendered in rescuing travellers are incalculable. A whole book might easily be filled with interesting adventures of which they were the heroes. In the Museum at Berne, we saw the stuffed body of the well-known dog, “Barry,” which is said to have saved the lives of no less than forty persons. The huge creatures were fond of being caressed; and one of them ran after our companion, as he was going up the hill-side by a wrong path, and pulled him back by the coat-tail!

After a substantial breakfast, we paid a visit to the chapel to deposit our alms in the alms-box, for though the monks make no charge for their hospitality, or even give the least hint of a donation, there is a box placed in the chapel for the benefit of the poor, and to this fund every traveller should contribute, at the very least, what the same accommodation would have cost him at an hotel. It is to be feared, however, that the great majority contribute nothing at all. Not one of the company who supped and breakfasted with us approached the chapel, having skulked away as soon as they could decently take leave; and yet they were bedizened with gold chains and jewellery of a costly description. There was one Scotchman present who carried out his sound protestant principles at the expense of the poor monks. He was a very thin, wiry man, but he ate an enormous supper and breakfast. He drank a bottle of wine at each meal, and helped himself most largely to everything on the table. He took what would have sufficed for four ordinary men, and, to our intense disgust, he rubbed down his stomach complacently in the morning ere departing, and said, in the hearing of all, that “he had made up his mind to put nothing in the alms-box, lest he should countenance popery!” The expenses of the establishment are very heavy, while the funds to meet them have been decreasing. Formerly the convent was the richest in Europe, possessing no less than eighty benefices. But Charles Emanuel III. of Sardinia, falling into a dispute with the Cantons of Switzerland about the nomination of a provost, sequestrated the possessions of the monks, leaving

them only a small estate in the Valais and in the Canton de Vaud. The French and Italian governments give an annual subsidy of a thousand pounds, while another thousand is raised by the gifts of travellers, and by collections made in Switzerland,—Protestants contributing as freely as Roman Catholics. Notwithstanding their comparative poverty, however, the monks are still as lavish and hospitable as ever, up to their utmost means. We ourselves were witnesses to a scene of profuse hospitality, which reminded us of the descriptions given of the bounty of abbeys in the middle ages. As it was the feast of the Assumption of the Virgin, crowds of beggars and tramps from the neighbouring valleys,—masses of human degradation and deformity of the most disgusting character,—were congregated about the kitchen door, clamorous for alms, while the monks were busy serving them with bread, cold meat, and wine. What they could not eat they carried away in baskets which they had brought for the purpose. Entering the chapel with our little offering, we were greatly struck with its magnificence, as contrasted with the excessive plainness of the outside, and the sterility of the spot. It is considered a very sacred place, for it contains the relics of no less than three famous saints, viz., St Bernard, St Hyrenæus, and St Maurice, of the celebrated Theban legion of Christians. Five massive gilt altars stood in various parts of the chapel, while the walls were adorned with frescoes and several fine paintings and statues. The marble tomb of Desaix, representing him in relief, wounded and sinking from his horse into the arms of his aid, Le Brun, was a conspicuous object. “I will give you the Alps for your monument,” said Napoleon, with tears in his eyes, to his dying friend; “you shall rest on their loftiest inhabited point.” The body of the general was carefully embalmed at Milan, and afterwards conveyed to the chapel, where it now reposes. A crowd of peasants, men and women, were kneeling, during our visit, in the body of the church, performing their devotions; while three or four monks, dressed in splendid habiliments of crimson and gold, were chanting the solemn melodies of a Gregorian mass, accompanied by the rich tones of a magnificent organ, and clouds of fragrant incense rose slowly to the roof.

Anxious to see the geographical bearings of the convent, we climbed up, with immense expenditure of breath and perspiration, a lofty precipitous peak close at hand. We had a most glorious view from the top, for the atmosphere was perfectly clear, and the remotest distances plainly visible. In front was “le Mont Blanc,” as the inhabitants proudly call it, and at this

distance of fifteen miles in a straight line, it looked infinitely higher and grander than when seen from the nearer and more commonly visited points of view at Chamouni. Far up, miles seemingly, in the deep blue sky, rose the dazzling whiteness of its summit, completely dwarfing all the other peaks around it. On our left was the enormously vast group of Monte Rosa, its everlasting snows tinged with the most delicate crimson hues of the rising sun ; while between them the stupendous obelisk of the Matterhorn, by far the sharpest and sublimest of the peaks of Europe, stormed the sky, with a long grey cloud flying at its summit like a flag of defiance. Around these three giant mountains, crowded a bewildering host of other summits, most of them above 13,000 feet high, with enormous glaciers streaming down their sides, and forming the sources of nearly all the great rivers of the continent. Our eye and soul turned away from this awful white realm of death, with relief, to the brown and green mountains of Italy, which just peered timidly, as it were, above that fearful horizon in the far south, with an indescribably soft, warm sky brooding over them, as if in sympathy. That little strip of mellow sky and naturally-coloured earth, was the only bond in all the wide view that united us to the cosy, lowly world of our fellow-creatures. Hurriedly descending, with many a picturesque tumble and glissade, which did not improve the continuity of our clothing, we reached the foot of the hill in safety. Shortly afterwards we bade adieu to our hospitable entertainers with mingled feelings of gratification and regret ; gratification, because we had seen so much that was new and interesting to us, and had been so kindly treated, though strangers in a strange land ; and regret, because the palmiest days of the Hospice are over, for the railway tunnel through Mont Cenis, which will soon be completed, will whirl away travellers direct into Italy, and few will care to turn aside, on a long and somewhat difficult journey, to visit the spot.

It is commonly said that we may learn some of the most useful lessons from our enemies. And certainly there is one lesson which, above all others, we may learn from a visit to the Hospice of St Bernard, and that is the lesson of beneficence, of doing good to all as we have opportunity. Whatever his creed, whatever his prejudices against the Roman Catholic religion, and against priests and monks in general, we do not believe that a single traveller ever quitted the hospitable roof of this fraternity without feelings of the highest respect for them. We yield to none in our detestation of the false faith which invented the tortures of the inquisition and lighted the martyr-fires of Smithfield, and whose blighting effects, on soul, and mind, and body, we have seen so frequently illustrated at home and abroad. We yield to none in our desire to see the

dominion of pope and priest for ever abolished, and the pure and glorious doctrines of the gospel preached everywhere instead of the soul-ruining dogmas of the Church of Rome. But still we cannot repress the admiration we feel for men like the monks of St Bernard, who, doubtless, with mistaken notions of self-salvation by works, but yet with pure and unselfish motives, carry out unweariedly the great precepts of the Sermon on the Mount, and thus put many of us Protestants to shame,—whose Christianity consists more in preaching and speaking than in practice. These young men, amid the monotony of a life crushed and deprived of all colour and fragrance, amid the fearful cold and privations of a polar climate, amid toils and dangers which would appal the heart of the stoutest of us, quietly and humbly, without any Pharisaical outcry, do, year after year, the work of the good Samaritan, without respect of persons or creeds, until at last a horrible death strikes them down one by one. Oh! is there one charitable soul who doubts that the righteous Judge on the great day of reckoning, will say to some at least of these noble monks, as he will say to all who have given a cup of cold water to a disciple in the name of a disciple, "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me!"

H. M.

ART. V.—*Young's Life and Light of Men.*

The Life and Light of Men. An Essay. By JOHN YOUNG, LL.D. (Edin.)
Alexander Strahan, Publisher, London and New York. 1866.

ALTHOUGH this work is a determined and thorough-going attack upon what are usually regarded as Evangelical principles, it is deserving, on several accounts, of careful and respectful treatment from evangelical reviewers; and as far as in us lies, it shall receive such treatment from us. The proved ability and religious earnestness of Dr Young, the service he has rendered to the cause of Christianity by his singularly striking and beautiful treatment of an important branch of the Evidences that has not yet been so much cultivated as it ought, and the influence which these powers and services are fitted to give to any views he puts forth, forbid this work to be handled without respect. The impression produced by his "Christ of History" is too fresh on our minds, and too thoroughly in his favour, to permit us to approach any work of his without being at the outset

favourably disposed, and expecting to meet in its pages much that is not only fresh and striking, but true, good, and seasonable. The work commands our respect also because it is the expression of honest opinion, by a man who has had the courage to make no small sacrifice for his opinions. Dr Young has been faithful enough to the claims of truth to give up his connection with the church to which he belonged, when he found that he could no longer believe its creed. This work is dedicated to the Moderator, Ministers, and Elders of the United Presbyterian Church; and is, in fact, a sort of manifesto addressed to his former fellow office-bearers, explaining and recommending the views he has been led to adopt. A man who has had the honesty and courage to make so painful a sacrifice out of regard to his convictions of truth, has put himself in such a position that what he has to say against the doctrines he has abandoned is entitled to be heard with great attention and respect; and we have much more satisfaction in dealing with such a one than with those who have persuaded themselves that they may entertain and propagate opinions that are diametrically opposed to the creed they profess. However much we regret the course that Dr Young has felt himself called to take for its own sake, we rejoice at it in so far as it has given a practical proof that, in the Presbyterian Churches at least, public creeds are a reality and not a mere empty form; and this all the more because, in this case, the Church's Confession has led to his separation of his own accord, and not by a process of ecclesiastical discipline.

But while we thus sincerely express our sense of what is due to this work, we must also frankly say, that had it not been for these considerations, we should have been inclined to pass it by with a very slight notice indeed. We do not think it at all worthy of Dr Young; and had it appeared anonymously, we should have considered that the extremely low view here taken of the work of Christ, together with the weakness of the arguments by which it is supported, would have rendered it so little likely to do harm as to need no elaborate exposure or review; but we cannot conceal from ourselves, that not only is Dr Young's well-merited reputation fitted to give his views entrance and currency in many quarters, but that if a mind like his could be led to such conclusions by such arguments as we find in this book, there must be a large class of minds more or less open to them, and, therefore, a somewhat greater need than we should have thought of a careful discussion of their real nature. In reading the work before us, while we have been greatly disappointed and grieved at the length to which the author

goes in rejecting the Evangelical doctrine, we have, at the same time, felt something like satisfaction in noting how little that is new or of any real force even so able a man has to allege against it, and how exceedingly forced and lame are his attempts to evade the Scriptural evidence in its favour. We have, therefore, felt no temptation to shrink from doing full justice to his views and arguments; but alike from respect for the man, and confidence in the truth and strength of our case against him, we are in a position to give his work an impartial consideration.

The title gives but a very imperfect description, and if one were to conjecture about it before opening the book itself, would suggest an erroneous idea of its subject. "The Life and Light of Men" might seem to promise an essay on the person of Christ, perhaps a following up of the line of thought and argument of "The Christ of History"; the work, however, is really a treatise on the doctrine of the Atonement, and contains nothing but what bears on that subject. The only justification of the title is that the author begins by a chapter on the Incarnation, and takes his start from it in approaching the subject he is going to discuss, thus indicating that he regards the doctrine of the work of Christ from the point of view afforded by a right understanding of his person. This we regard as the true and Scriptural mode of viewing the matter, and as well fitted to remove difficulties and lead to clear and sound views as to the Atonement, though we should probably not be at one with Dr Young in the way of stating the relation between the person and the work of our Saviour. But as he has not brought out his views on this point at all fully, we do not feel called upon to enter into the subject. Dr Young says, with reference to the great doctrine of the Incarnation, "I venture to suppose that too little is made of this central truth, and that much of its meaning, and many of its very vital bearings are not understood or not appreciated" (p. 8). With several qualifications, we might be inclined to agree with him in this opinion, and certainly we gladly approach anew the subject of the work of Christ, under the guidance of one who proposes to conduct us to it by way of his Incarnation. But we have not proceeded far in this interesting line in the company of our author, before grave doubts arise in our minds whether what he describes as the Incarnation is really the same as that which the great body of Christians, in all ages, have recognised as revealed in Scripture; and by the time we have reached the end of his first chapter, the conviction is forced upon us that it is seriously different from

it. The old theologians usually began the exposition of the Incarnation by considering who was the person who became man ; and in order to settle that, presupposed the distinction of persons in the Godhead. But our author not only does not clearly answer that primary question at all, but seems studiously to avoid saying anything that would imply the existence of more persons than one in the Godhead. We say studiously, because we can hardly conceive it possible that any man could write so much on the Incarnation without once alluding to the doctrine of the Trinity, unless he wished and intended to avoid it ; while Dr Young has, through all his long and, in many respects, beautiful treatment of the subject, never, even by a word or the turn of a phrase, said or hinted that it was a person distinct from the Father who became man. His first statement of the doctrine, at p. 6, is true and unobjectionable so far as it goes, only it is rendered indefinite by the use simply of "very God" as the subject of the proposition. But this is really the nearest approach he can make to orthodox language ; and when he speaks more fully and freely, we find that he not only avoids anything that would imply a distinction of divine persons, but says what is positively inconsistent with it. Thus, in his fuller illustration of the Incarnation, in pp. 23 foll., he continually implies, and often asserts in express terms, that it was God, our Father, who became incarnate. "God entered into the soul of Jesus : he united himself with it," p. 26 ; "Our Father humbled Himself, sacrificed Himself, to come near to us in Christ," p. 28, &c., &c. At the very outset of his work, he had explained John i. 1, in a way that we might pass over as a mere peculiarity of expression, but which we now see to have a meaning : "'The Logos was with God,' essentially related to God, eternally connected and identified with God," p. 5. Further on, it appears that he does not identify, as John does, the Logos and the only-begotten Son of God ; for, at p. 41, he explains God's "only-begotten and well-beloved Son" as being a true human being, preternaturally introduced and added to the race. He speaks habitually of the Incarnation as a sacrifice of God ; and that in no mere rhetorical and hyperbolical use of language, but as involving the true idea of sacrifice which he desires to substitute for that of a satisfaction to divine justice. With all this, there can be no doubt as to what his own sentiments are, at least negatively. It clearly appears that he denies any real Trinity, any distinction of persons in the Godhead. Any kind of Trinity that he can hold must be at the highest Sabellian only ; and we are sorry to be constrained to add, that there are indications in this book

that raise a doubt whether it may not be even lower. If in any real sense he holds the divinity of Christ, he is a Patripassian, maintaining that the Father was personally united with the man Christ Jesus, acting through him and suffering in him. But it may be questioned whether his system admits a real Incarnation at all,—a divine person made man, and not merely a divine power or influence in Jesus. We state these views of his, not for the purpose of controverting or disproving them, but simply to shew that his deviations from the immemorial and Catholic doctrine of the Church, are much more serious and far-reaching even than he himself seems to be aware of. For while he openly avows his opposition to the commonly-received doctrine of the Atonement, he advances his views on the Incarnation apparently without the slightest idea that he is doing anything but expounding what is universally believed. We are glad to find that the view we have formed for ourselves of his opinions on this subject, involving, as it does, a charge of so serious a departure from right views of the person of Christ, is confirmed in every particular by Dr A. Hodge, in his valuable work on the Atonement, which has recently been published. Referring to a subsequent passage in Dr Young's book, where he charges the doctrine of satisfaction with involving Tritheism, he says :—

“ He admits, that ‘ when we bow in adoring reverence before the eternal essential Unity, it is not hard to think of distinct *aspects* blending mysteriously and harmoniously in one being, or of distinct *agencies* and *influences* springing out of one source,’ Although we have not time to dwell upon the point, it is impossible not to notice the very significant fact that, although he professes to be, and doubtless is in his heart a devout believer in the real divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, yet having adopted the Unitarian theory as to the nature of Christ's work, he necessarily gravitates towards the Unitarian theory as to the constitution of his person. In the above extract, which harmonises with the tone of the whole book, he distinctly excludes the Scriptural doctrine of the threefold distinction of persons in the unity of essence. If the first clause, in which he speaks of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost as ‘ distinct *aspects*,’ stood alone, we would credit him with being a Sabellian, holding that God is one single person as well as one single essence, and admitting a modal threefoldness in respect to manifestation and operation. But in the second clause, which doubtless he intends to be exegetical of the first, he represents the divine in Christ and the Holy Ghost to be ‘ *agencies* or *influences*’ springing out of a divine source. Neither Strauss nor Renan would object to such a statement of the Trinity as involved in a rational conception of the person of Christ. Let the reader, for the purpose of tracing the connection, compare Bushnell's book on the ‘ Vicarious Sacrifice,’ in which he gives the Unitarian view as to the work of Christ, with the

radically defective view of the person of our Lord given in his 'God in Christ.' ""*

Dr Young's second chapter, which is on Human Sin, does not call for much remark. He lays down very broadly and emphatically the position, that the sin of man is the one and only reason of the Incarnation; and it is indeed necessary for his system to maintain it, for the Incarnation is, in his view, itself the sacrifice by which we are redeemed. Now we do not by any means see our way to adopt the theory of Dorner and others: that the Son of God would have become man even had there been no fall. But it surely must be admitted that this is at least conceivable; and a theology that involves as a fundamental position the dogmatic denial of this, burdens itself with a very serious and difficult task. We may be content to meet the speculations of those profound and ingenious thinkers with a verdict of Not proven, which is all, we think, that Scripture very clearly warrants; our author must prove the negative as a cardinal point of his faith. Besides, whatever may be said on that question, the Incarnation surely reaches further in its consequences, and has positive effects on the saved, higher and more blessed by far than the mere negative removal of the evil of sin. In fact, Dr Young's peculiar view of the Incarnation, as a divine sacrifice, while it explains away the idea of sacrifice, seems to us also to narrow the bearing and so lower the glory of the Incarnation itself, so that he has, to our mind, entirely failed in the very object he set before himself at the outset. For, indeed, it is not by the moral-influence view (as it is called) of the work of Christ, but by the doctrine of satisfaction, that the glory of his person and the value of his Incarnation are really most exalted. Passing from this, however, and acknowledging much that is powerfully urged in a practical way on the nature of sin, we come to our author's statement of the doctrine as to the way of salvation by Christ's death, which he opposes in the second section of this chapter, pp. 62-3, a statement to which we take decided exception. We give him credit for being sincerely desirous of presenting the doctrine in question with the utmost fairness; but surely he must have forgotten something of his early instructions, "in the family, from the pulpit, and from the chair of our theological hall," of which he speaks in his dedication; and trusting to his long familiarity with "the ground, nature, evidences, and defences" of the doctrine, he must have failed to refresh

* "The Atonement," by the Rev. Archibald Alexander Hodge, D.D., Philadelphia, 1867; pp. 188, 189.

his memory by a reference to any of the old text-books, before he gave the statement he has done as "its best and truest form." Something of this sort has, we imagine, actually been the case. For his statement is not such a perversion and caricature of the doctrine as we sometimes meet with; it is one that might pass current without remark in a popular exposition of the subject; but it is inadequate and one-sided as a theological statement of it. It is just such a statement as would be made, from memory, of a doctrine he had rejected, by one who would, with all desire to be fair, naturally recall most readily that aspect of it that had repelled him. He represents the received doctrine of the Atonement as starting from the conception of sin as a debt. But, surely, if he ever consulted, not to say studied, such very common books in Scottish divinity halls as "Turretine's Theology," or "Hill's Institutes," he must have known once, however he has forgotten now, that the doctrine of satisfaction proceeds upon the very opposite assumption, that sin is to be regarded *not* exclusively as a debt, and that if it be viewed in no other light than that, the doctrine cannot be maintained. Had he remembered this, he would have been saved from repeating the hackneyed objection, so often made, and so often answered, that "grace which is purchased and paid for must lose not only its special beauty, but even its essential worth." The only plausibility in this arises from confounding the pecuniary idea of the payment of a debt, with the judicial idea of satisfaction for a crime. When a debt is paid by any one, no matter whom, there is no grace in its remission to the debtor. Nay, there is no obstacle in reason or propriety to the remission of a debt without any payment at all; so that to regard sin exclusively as a debt, does, when strictly carried out, cut away the ground from under the Atonement altogether. But justice requires the punishment of crime; and the very idea of satisfaction by the substitution of anything else for the legal penalty, as that idea exists both in the Mosaic and Roman law, implies that the party to whom the penalty is due is at liberty to accept or refuse the substitute, and exercises free grace in releasing the offender even when satisfaction is rendered, so that in the forgiveness of sin on the ground of the satisfaction of divine justice by Christ, the free grace of God is manifested, not only in providing the sacrifice to be made, but in accepting it when made. By falling into such a blunder as this, Dr Young has shown that whatever he may once have known, he does not *now* understand the doctrine of satisfaction, as it is expounded by its judicious defenders; and we are not likely to be brought over to the view he

advocates, until we find him, or some of its advocates, showing that they understand the doctrine we hold.

But if Dr Young does not understand our view, let us not do him the same injustice, but endeavour to understand his; and for that purpose let us go on to his next chapter, which is entitled "Spiritual Laws," in which he begins to unfold it. We come here to the root of the matter. Law is the fundamental idea in the whole class of questions connected with the atonement; and according as our notions of law are, will be our views of the work of Christ. Now our author uses a somewhat peculiar phrase here. Where it is customary to speak of moral laws, he prefers to call them spiritual. This peculiar phrase indicates a somewhat peculiar view. He does not, like some of the Broad Church divines, altogether confound them with the laws of nature. He rightly points out a distinction between them in the fact that they are necessary, eternal, and immutable, founded not upon the will even of God, but self-existent, uncreated, and imperishable. So far his view harmonises with what has been held by the advocates of the highest doctrine of atonement. But the peculiarity of it comes out when he goes on to maintain, that these laws include not only what are usually known as moral laws, the categorical imperative of Kant, "Thou shalt, Thou oughtest," but also the penalties by which that imperative is sanctioned. This seems to be the reason why he substitutes the term spiritual for moral, that it may cover both the command and the penalty, and the attribute of necessity, according to him, applies apparently equally to both. For he says they need no extrinsic sanctions:—"But on no such grounds as these, nor on any other grounds whatever, do spiritual ordinances need or admit of vindication, or protection, or support from human or divine hands. Defender or avenger they have none, and they need none. Without aid from any quarter they avenge themselves, and exact, and continue without fail to exact, as long as the evil remains, the amount of penalty—visible and invisible—to the veriest jot and tittle, which the deed of violation deserves. Essentially and perfectly wise and right, they are irresistible, in the case of the obedient and the rebellious alike," p. 87. This is a strong and bold statement. But it is all mere assertion, unsupported by any vestige of proof. Our author asserts his position broadly and dogmatically enough; he illustrates it, unfolds it, bases further conclusions upon it; but does not make an approach to proving it. It is not self-evident; it is not a view generally admitted by those with whom he is arguing; yet he seems to think it unnecessary to show its

truth, either from reason or from Scripture. The only sort of attempt he makes to do so is when he says, p. 88, "Sin is death—holiness is life; these brief sentences taken out of inspired Scripture, are a condensation of the code of the spiritual universe." But where are these sentences to be found in Scripture? They occur nowhere in express terms; and if it be said that they embody the substance of what Scripture teaches, this should have been proved, and not taken for granted. Dr Young is very indignant in the subsequent part of his book against the doctrine of satisfaction, because, as he alleges, it introduces terms and definitions that have no express warrant in Scripture; but here we find him doing the very same thing himself, in laying the foundation of his own theory. While in a certain sense we admit his propositions may be true, it seems to us, that the Bible much more frequently distinguishes death from sin as its wages or punishment, and life from holiness as its reward or fruit, than it identifies them. But even the identification, though without express Scripture warrant, will not serve the purpose intended, unless it be understood in a particular way. For he goes on to say, "But it must be noted, they are not so much sanctions ordained by God, as simple statements of fact, the statement of an eternal fact embodying the literal history of all the past, and a predictive announcement of all the future, for ever and ever. Sin is death, holiness is life; the fact is so, and the law of moral being is promulgated in the fact." Now we submit that this is not a deduction from Scripture at all. Certain propositions are taken from the Bible, and expressed in a more absolute form than they are ever found there; and then, after all, a particular meaning has to be attached to them in accordance with a certain speculative theory, before they can be available for the purpose intended.

If Dr Young had condescended to explain the grounds of his doctrine of spiritual laws, either by Biblical exposition or by philosophical argument; we might have felt called on to discuss, and if possible, refute it; but as it is, this is not necessary, for a simple consideration of the consequences he deduces from it, is sufficient to prove it to be utterly false and unscriptural. It follows, from the above conception of spiritual laws, that punishment is simultaneous with sin; as soon as the sin is committed, the punishment is inflicted (p. 90); and as long as the sin continues, but no longer, the punishment continues. Dr Young says:—

"No term of punishment is fixed; none can be fixed. One thing, and one thing only, determines the duration of the punishment, and that is the continuance of evil in the soul. The evil continuing, its

attendant penalty is a necessity, which even God could not conquer. Sin is punishment, and punishment lies in the nature of sin. Led astray by the analogies of human administration, we imagine that a long and dark array of conscious or forgotten sins, as yet unpunished, is loudly witnessing against us, and calling for righteous retribution. And it is true, strictly true, that so long as sin is within us, it must continue, not only to call for retribution, but to bring down its penalty, as at the first. But it is equally true, that no sin is, or ever can be, unpunished a moment, because it ever constantly punishes itself"—

with more to the same effect, pp. 95, 96. This is not an inference of our deducing, but the author's expressly and emphatically asserted opinion. But any theological position more fatal and self-condemning we can hardly imagine, for it flatly contradicts some of the plainest statements of Scripture. What becomes of the forbearance and long-suffering of God on this view? Is not that an attribute of his character and a characteristic of his government, asserted, not in one or two single texts, but in hundreds of passages? It is written, as with a sunbeam, on the very forefront of revelation, and interwoven with the gospel itself, that God is long-suffering to usward, not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance; that he hath not dealt with us according to our sins, nor rewarded us according to our iniquities; that he keeps silence now, and suffers men and nations to go on in their own ways. If this be not the teaching of the Bible, we despair of ever attaining a certain knowledge even of its plainest and most frequent assertions. Yet Dr Young's theory denies this. In like manner, there cannot be, on his view, any real judgment day, any further punishment of sin than what is inflicted in this life, or any distinction whatever between the present dispensation, as one of probation, involving the possibility of salvation or ruin, and the future dispensation as one of retribution, where the destiny of all is fixed for ever. But if these be not among the fundamental principles, not only of revealed, but even of natural religion, we know not what are; yet these principles are entirely subverted and overthrown by our author's doctrine of spiritual laws. It is a doctrine, as it seems to us, which, altogether apart from its bearing on the atonement, is of the most dangerous practical tendency. If men come to be persuaded that punishment necessarily and always follows sin, as much here and now as in another world and a future life, all the eloquence and solemnity with which men like Dr Young can enforce the awfulness and the horror of that penalty that accompanies sin, will not prevent the careless from concluding, that as these consequences cause them so little uneasiness now, so

they may cause them no more hereafter. No such hopes are countenanced in the least by the prophets and apostles, when they, in a very different strain, warn us of a judgment and a wrath to come, of which we can form no conception, since we are living, with all our sin, under a dispensation of most gracious forbearance, that may well move us to repentance and encourage us to count the long-suffering of our Lord salvation.

Dr Young maintains that the laws of the spiritual universe are sufficient for themselves, and need no vindication or support, as they execute themselves, pp. 97, foll. In this he appears to honour and magnify them, but in reality, as it seems to us, he only lowers and degrades these laws. For in truth, the laws of which he makes so much are of no higher sort than natural laws, after all is said. They are indeed spiritual, as opposed to material, but they are still only natural as opposed to moral. They are invariable sequences in the spiritual universe, and nothing more; just as the physical laws of nature are invariable sequences in the material world. He attributes to them, indeed, the property of necessity, as distinguishing them from physical laws; but the necessity he ascribes to them is a natural necessity, not an intellectual or moral one, it is the necessity of decrees of fate, not that of self-evident axioms of reason or dictates of conscience. And throughout his whole exposition of them, he does not assert, in the most cursory way, or allude by the remotest hint, to the one element that is the *differentia* of moral law, as distinguished from natural, the idea of duty. Now, however much may be said of laws as necessary, eternal, immutable, and the like, if that idea be not recognised as involved in them, they are, after all, only natural laws, whether of matter or of spirit, not moral laws, which bind the conscience and evoke the response, "I ought." The whole chapter is thus pervaded and radically vitiated by the great root fallacy of the present day, the confused and inadequate notion of moral law.

This comes out more clearly in the next chapter, which is on "Eternal Justice." In it he boldly maintains that justice, rectilineal justice, as he calls it, *i.e.*, that which consists in giving every one his desert, and neither more or less, is not an attribute of God at all. "The great God is never unjust, that is impossible. He is never less than just, but he is, he always is, more than just" (p. 112). This idea he repeats with all possible emphasis, in a variety of forms, throughout a long paragraph; and imagines he proves by adducing a number of the many Scripture descriptions of God as good, kind, merciful, gracious; closing with repeat-

ing, of rectilineal justice, "There is no such attribute in God" (p. 115). How any believing divine could venture upon a statement so flatly and irreconcilably opposed to Scripture, we are utterly unable to understand; or how one of such intellectual ability as Dr Young, could imagine that the Scripture representations of the goodness and grace of God are at all inconsistent with the ascription to him of strict rectilineal, or, as it has been more commonly called, distributive justice, such as is plainly implied in multitudes of other passages. What mean the solemn announcements that he will lay "judgment to the line, and righteousness to the plummet" (Isa. xxviii. 17); that he "will render to every man according to his deeds" (Rom. ii. 6); that "we must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ, that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad" (2 Cor. v. 10); "that it is a righteous thing in God to recompense tribulation to them which trouble his people, and to them which are troubled rest" (2 Thess. i. 6)? what mean these and others of like import in every part of Scripture, if not to ascribe to God that justice that consists in rendering to each his own desert? or in what plainer or more emphatic language could this be asserted? True it is, that in this world God is not thus retributively just; he is more than just, he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and the good, and sendeth rain on the just and the unjust; but unless Dr Young had, by his theory of spiritual laws, virtually abolished the distinction between the present dispensation of forbearance and the future one of retribution, he could not have forgotten that if God is represented in Scripture as winking at the sin of men, it is in prospect of the day he hath appointed in the which he will judge the world in righteousness (Acts xvii. 30, 31); and that his forbearance in passing over the sins that are past can only be vindicated by the manifestation of his righteousness in the propitiation by the blood of Christ (Rom. iii. 25). Dr Young, perhaps, imagines that he does justice to the scriptural view of the retributive punishment of sin, by what he goes on to maintain about what he calls the justice of the universe, according to which, sin punishes itself. The spiritual laws, of which he has said so much, act inevitably necessarily in bringing down punishment on sin. But this is altogether apart from God's agency.

"The doom of the lost, be it whatever it may, is simply and wholly their own work. God has had, and has in it, no part whatever. It is all, from first to last, not only their doing, but their doing in despite of God. . . . There is an eternal justice in harmony with the highest will, though not dependent upon it. The law of the universe is truly

God's law, but, like himself, is eternal and immutable. Wherever sin is, and so long as it continues, punishment is inevitable. Nothing can hinder it. . . . With profound reverence let it be uttered, that that even God exercises no power of punishing or not according to his pleasure, and in what degree it seems good to him. . . . Essentially considered, and in one form or other, physical evil is the inevitable effect of moral evil. God has nothing to do with the production of this effect, but he reigns supremely, and has chosen to reign, over all its distributions, its times, and its modes. Mercifully he reigns over these, and directs and shapes that suffering, which, independently of him, was in one form or other inevitable, so as to act powerfully on the moral nature of men, and to retrieve, as far as that is possible, the deeper curse in which all physical evil originates. But eternal justice, meaning the inevitable punishment of sin, takes its course resistlessly."—Pp. 117–119.

Now, we are willing to put the most favourable construction possible on these startling statements. We are willing to believe that Dr Young, as he calls this eternal justice the justice of the universe, regards it simply as the law which God the Creator has imposed upon the world he created, and thus ultimately subordinate to him. Even on this understanding, however, the view he advances must be regarded as akin to that theory of divine providence, which regards the Creator as having impressed upon the forces of the universe their laws at the beginning, and left them to continue under the operation of these laws without any direct action of his own; and which denies, on this ground, that these laws can be suspended or interrupted by miracles or otherwise; and it is liable to all the objections to which that theory is exposed. As we are accustomed to regard this as a very low and inadequate view of God's work of providence, and to view all the laws of nature as merely the expressions of God's uniform way of working, and as being thus absolutely under his control; so we cannot but consider that Dr Young's view of spiritual laws is, even on the best construction, one that is unworthy of God, and unduly trenches upon his absolute sovereignty and power over all the created universe. But we are constrained to say, that some of Dr Young's expressions make us doubtful whether he does not really give to the so-called justice of the universe even a higher place, and represent it as virtually a necessity that is independent of God, and above him. We do not wish to charge him with anything that he does not actually hold, and therefore shall not enlarge upon this, for we are really in considerable doubt which of these two views, both of them highly unscriptural and dangerous, though by no means equally so, he maintains. But whichever be the view that

he really holds, we are surprised, we are more than surprised, we are amazed, and utterly unable to explain to ourselves how a man like Dr Young can acquiesce in such a theory. He finds fault with the doctrine of satisfaction, because it seems to him to give a hard, stern, judicial aspect to God and his dealings with men. But surely he has not found refuge in any milder or less rigid view, when he adopts the theory of spiritual laws, which we have seen he maintains. For is it less repugnant to a mind that desires a gentler, softer, more feeling view of the government of the world, to conceive of its laws as self-acting powers, working out, with an unchangeable precision and iron force, their necessary and inevitable results, and which, if they have been established and set in motion by a personal God, are now independent even of his control and exempt from his interference; than to regard them as the authoritative expressions of the holy will of a living God, who administers them each moment in infinite goodness and justice, and who, even in his righteous anger, knows and pities the frailty of his creatures; who is slow to anger and of great mercy, who has no pleasure in the death of the wicked, but whose nature and whose name is love? Surely our author cannot have thoroughly thought out his own system, or he must be blinded by partiality to its defects; for no one, who fully and impartially considers it, will be at all likely to accept of it as affording any relief from what he may feel to be a hard and unlovely mode of setting forth the relations of God to his intelligent creatures. For our own part, we feel most deeply, that the evangelical doctrine, however it may sometimes have been marred in the statement by unskilful or unfeeling expounders, and however the exigencies of controversy may have forced its severer aspect into prominence, is in reality infinitely more gracious than any that can be put in its place, with the least appearance of agreement with the teaching of Scripture and the facts of experience.

Hitherto we have followed Dr Young in the exposition of his own views; but in the chapters which follow he proceeds to do what he had not attempted before,—to bring his opinions into comparison with Scripture, and attempt to shew that they harmonise with its language. It is remarkable that, while one of the chief objections that Dr Young, like others of his school, brings against what he calls the scholastic theory, is that it overlays the simple truths of Scripture with the theories of a certain kind of philosophy and logic, he himself should be guilty of this very fault in a far greater degree than any of the theologians he opposes.

His theory is not developed from an exposition of Scripture teaching, but from certain speculative principles, which are different indeed from the system of philosophy he condemns, but are no less really only philosophical, and not scriptural. He spends more than 120 pages of his book in discussion on a purely philosophical ground, before he comes to the interpretation of Scripture at all; and even when he does approach the Word of God, the arguments he founds upon it are virtually no more than negative. He attempts to shew, and thinks he succeeds in shewing, that the language of Scripture does not necessarily teach the doctrine of satisfaction; but he hardly even professes to prove, that it asserts or countenances his own peculiar theory about spiritual laws, sin, and its remedy. Now we will venture to say, that few of those scholastic divines, whom he blames so much for corrupting the simplicity of the gospel with the forms and notions of Aristotle, have based their systems so much on philosophy as he has done; and that none would have been content with a view, of which it could only be maintained, that it was not absolutely contradicted by Scripture. For, in truth, although the principles and methods of philosophy have been of signal use in contributing to a clear, accurate, and consistent statement of theological doctrine, yet the greatest systematic and scholastic divines have ever maintained, that their system, in every part, is derived from, and founded upon, revelation, and have shewn no lack of readiness and skill in the discussion of the meaning of Scripture. Any one who regards them as mere framers of syllogisms and systems would be surprised on reading, for example, Turretine's "*Disputationes de Satisfactione Christi*," at the amount they contain of excellent, able, and careful exegetical discussion, that is hardly antiquated even by the great advance that has been made in scholarship and criticism since their time.

But to return to our author. Coming to the teaching of Scripture, he discusses at some length the principal words used to express the commonly received doctrine. The leading term, satisfaction, he objects to, as "purely a term of artificial theology," not found either in the Old or in the New Testament (p. 130). Now, even if this were so, it is no more than can be said of a number of other terms in theology, such as Trinity, Incarnation, original sin, sacrament, and the like, which, though not scriptural, are generally acknowledged to be both warrantable and useful. If the things meant by such terms be taught in Scripture, the only effect of laying the words aside would be, that the statement of truth would be rendered much more cumbrous, and the dis-

cussion of various opinions more complicated and difficult than it is. The same may be said of the word satisfaction, even on the lowest ground. But we do not admit that it stands merely on the same level with these terms, for we believe that it has, if not expressly and formally, yet really, the sanction of Scripture. The word satisfaction occurs twice over in one passage, and it is the only place where it occurs in our English Bibles, Num. xxxv. 31-33, "Ye shall take no satisfaction for the life of a murderer, which is guilty of death; but he shall be surely put to death. And ye shall take no satisfaction for him that is fled to the city of his refuge, that he should come again to dwell in the land until the death of the priest. So ye shall not pollute the land wherein ye are, for blood it defileth the land, and the land cannot be cleansed (*Heb.*, there can be no expiation for the land) of the blood that is shed therein, but by the blood of him that shed it." Here it is obvious that satisfaction is used precisely in the way in which it is employed by evangelical divines, not in the general sense of pleasing, gratifying, but in the precise, technical, legal signification of doing or offering something to meet the claims of justice. This was allowed in some cases by the Mosaic law. When, for example, an ox, by the culpable neglect of its owner, was allowed to kill a man or woman, the general law was, "The ox shall be stoned, and his owner also shall be put to death" (Ex. xxi. 29). The avenger of blood, or the judge, might, as it should seem, insist on the extreme penalty. But he might also accept of a satisfaction instead, for the law proceeds, "If there be laid on him a sum of money, then he shall give for the ransom of his life whatsoever is laid upon him," v. 30. A satisfaction (it is the same word that is here rendered "sum of money") might be accepted in this case; and the purpose of the law in Numbers was to prevent such an arrangement in cases of murder. This is a precise illustration of our doctrine of the atonement, and the combination of justice and grace in it. Supposing a man had fallen under the claims of the law in Exodus, if a friend, if the avenger of blood himself, were to present a sum of money on his behalf, that would not, *ipso facto*, liberate him, as of right, like the payment of a debt; it would be open to the judge to insist upon the penalty of death, and it would be for him to consider whether he could graciously accept the satisfaction. Now the word in the original for satisfaction is כִּפָּר (rendered in the LXX. by λύτρον), a word connected in a twofold way with the work of Christ. It is, on the one hand, the substantive related to the verb (כִּפֶּה) constantly

used for expiation, propitiation by sacrifice; and, on the other hand, it is itself most commonly rendered by the term ransom, and frequently applied to Christ. His own words, "The Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many," might, with perfect propriety, be rendered, "A satisfaction in the room of many." When we examine carefully the usage of language in the Old Testament, and especially when we note the remarkable way in which juridical and sacrificial ideas are interwoven as it were at many points, we cannot avoid the conclusion, that the doctrine of satisfaction is that to which they point as their solution and key, fitting in at every point, like the value of an unknown quantity in an equation, or the wards of a key to the intricacies of the lock. And when, in the light of the phraseology of the Mosaic law, we read such statements of the inspired apostles as these, "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us;" "Who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity;" "Ye were not redeemed with corruptible things as silver and gold . . . but with the precious blood of Christ;" we hold ourselves entitled to maintain, that these teach the doctrine of satisfaction as definitely and precisely as any of the symbols of the church or systems of theology. We have entered thus minutely into this topic, because we believe, with Dr Hodge, that the old term satisfaction is, when rightly understood, the most correct and appropriate one for expressing the doctrine of the work of Christ, and, therefore, attach some importance to the circumstance, that it is in substance a scriptural term.

We cannot enter at such length into Dr Young's verbal criticism of the term atonement and its synonyms. While he contends, and correctly enough, that the word atonement, in the English New Testament, is used in its old sense, simply for reconciliation (at-one-ment), he has the candour to admit that, in the Greek Scriptures, terms are employed, both in reference to the Mosaic sacrifices and to the death of Christ, which, according to their invariable classical use, convey the idea of expiation or propitiation. But he thinks that it does not necessarily follow, that this was the idea that the sacred writers intended to express, and that there are strong reasons to conclude that it was not. The only reasons he adduces are, that sometimes other words, such as cleanse, sanctify, reconcile, are used; and that the phrase is sometimes applied to inanimate things, to which he holds the idea of propitiation by satisfaction is altogether inapplicable. But the former of these

facts would seem far more naturally to lead to the conclusion, not that propitiation signifies nothing more than reconciliation or consecration, but that the consecration or reconciliation spoken of in the passages in question was accomplished by propitiation, and closely connected with it. As to his second argument, whatever difficulty may be felt in harmonising the atonements made in the Levitical ceremonies for inanimate things with the doctrine of satisfaction, there is a far greater difficulty, as it seems to us, in explaining them on our author's own view of the nature of Christ's work, for here again he seems to have forgotten that he is bound to support his theory by positive proof from Scripture, and imagined that he has only to make it appear that the doctrine he opposes is not necessarily taught in the Bible. He has, we think, entirely failed to weaken the effect of the frequent use of admittedly sacrificial language of the work of Christ.

We may notice in this connection, Dr Young's attempt to get rid of the evidence which has usually been regarded as accruing to the orthodox doctrine from the word justify and its cognates. "The word," he says, "used by our translators, 'justify,' has a very unambiguous sense. According to ordinary, or rather universal usage, it means to vindicate, to clear, to right or righten, or set right a person or a transaction; to vindicate, and nothing else; with only such modifications as are readily and naturally included in this term," p. 166. Now to us it does not appear that this is an explanation of the word at all; the explanatory synonyms are to our mind at least as obscure and ambiguous as the word they are adduced to explain. More especially we object to the explanation "to righten or set right," though that is the one that ultimately finds most favour with Dr Young. In one view it might be regarded as simply equivalent to vindicate, but it plainly appears that our author uses it as meaning, sometimes at least, not simply to declare, but to make right. For he says, "For the man who has been really wrong, who has acted wrongfully by his neighbour, and harboured wrong feelings against him, there can be no vindication except in an entire change of mind and of conduct. You justify him only when you set him really right,—when you induce him to abandon and condemn the wrong, and to choose and cleave to the right," p. 167. Now this is not the meaning of the phrase, "justifying the wicked," either in classical Greek authors, or in the LXX. In the former it generally means, as in old Scotch phraseology, to punish, *i. e.* to treat justly according to his deserts (see *e. g.* Herodotus i. 100). In the latter it

describes the act of an unjust judge, wrongfully acquitting a criminal (compare, in LXX., Isa. v. 23 with Prov. xvii. 15). We are aware, indeed, that Dr Donaldson, an accomplished scholar, maintains that the word is not used in the New Testament in its classical sense,* but we do not know on what grounds such an opinion can be established; and we rather think that the weight of critical and exegetical authority is very decidedly on the other side. The truth seems to be, that both Dr Donaldson and Dr Young have been misled, by taking the theological descriptions of God's justification of sinners for interpretations of the meaning of the term justification in the abstract. The former says, "The meaning ascribed to it is, to treat a person who is guilty as if he really were not guilty;" and he adds, "Only the most concurring evidence of unquestionable examples of such a use of the word would justify a man in giving it this meaning. And no such examples can be found within the past three centuries at least." Now we do not ascribe that meaning to the *word* justify, by itself; we say that it means simply to declare or treat as righteous, and that the context must determine whether the person so justified is really righteous or no. But we read, in Paul's epistle to the Romans, that sinners are justified freely by God's grace. This at first sight would suggest, according to the Old Testament usage of the word, the act of the unjust judge; and accordingly we find the apostle is at pains to shew how, by the redemption (= satisfaction) that is in Christ Jesus, whom he hath set forth as a propitiation, God is just, even in justifying him that believeth in Jesus (Rom. iii. 24-26). Moreover, we do not hold that justification consists in God's declaring a man to be righteous, who is in no sense righteous: it is his so accounting those who are, as an old Scottish catechism well puts it, "just in Christ, but sinners in ourselves." In like manner, Dr Young, after quoting the description of justification from the Shorter Catechism of the Westminster Assembly, observes, that it includes much more than the word is ordinarily understood to contain. But surely no one who reads the question and answer in the light of what has gone before, would understand the question, "What is justification?" in the sense of "what is the meaning of the word justify, in general and by itself?" but, "What is that benefit called justification, which they that are effectually called partake of?" and in answering *this* ques-

* "Donaldson's Critical History of Christian Literature and Doctrine," Vol. i. p. 77.

tion, the Westminster divines naturally and properly state, not only what is the formal nature of justification, but what is its origin, its ground, and the means of its appropriation and enjoyment by us. It never occurred to us, till we read Dr Young's remarks, to suppose that the answer meant that the bare word justify by itself, wherever it occurred, includes all that is said; but only that the ideas imported into it, as Dr Young says, are an embodiment of what Scripture teaches as to the way in which we are justified: and we must contend, in opposition to his statement, that these ideas are introduced, not for the sake of the exigencies of the theological system, but on the plain warrant of Scripture. This is strongly confirmed by the fact, that such highly competent and impartial expositors as De Wette, Meyer, and Alford, recognise the forensic sense of justify as unquestionably the meaning of Paul; while Jowett, who is by far the ablest scholar who denies it, can only do so by maintaining, that the apostle's dialect and style is so loose, as not to admit of the application of the rules of classical Greek, or of the deduction of any very certain and definite doctrine from his writings.

We cannot enter into a discussion of Dr Young's explanation of the meaning of the Old Testament sacrifices, in accordance with his theory; we may only remark, that here, too, the vast preponderance of available authority is against our author. All the Jewish rabbis, without a dissentient voice, and the greater number of Christian scholars and critics, attribute to the Mosaic sacrifices the nature of vicarious endurance of punishment for the satisfaction of divine justice; and the objections which Dr Young raises against this view of them, are really too weak and trivial to have much weight. Neither can we follow him in his survey of the history of the doctrine, which occupies the closing chapter of his book, and in which he attempts to shew that it was unknown in the earlier and purer ages of the church, and was the invention of the scholastic divinity of the middle ages. There is less need for a discussion on this topic, because we believe that we are very nearly at one with Dr Young as to the facts, though we object to the inference he draws from them. We admit that up to the time of Anselm, the doctrine of satisfaction was seldom if ever stated with that accuracy and completeness that would exclude all cavil or doubt; but this is no more than can be said of the doctrine of the Trinity before Athanasius, of that of the person of Christ before the Council of Chalcedon, of the doctrines of grace before Augustine, or even of that of justification before Luther. All these were implicitly contained in the faith of true Christians from

the first; but it required ages of discussion, and generally of controversy too, to develop them in an explicit form. In so far as any argument might be drawn from the teaching of the early Fathers-as to the meaning of that of Scripture, we think that Dr Young has virtually given up the question, when he says, with a candour for which we must give him credit:—"At the same time, it is fully admitted that the ultimate and real question after all goes back to the meaning of the New Testament itself. No one could fairly dispute, that if the doctrine of satisfaction be there, it is also in the post-apostolic writings. But if it be wanting there, as we have sought to shew that it is, then unquestionably it has no place in them" (p. 437). This latter statement we as frankly accept as he has made the former admission. We do not base any argument for the doctrine of satisfaction on the writings of the Fathers; for we do not think this is one of those cases in which any light either need or can be thrown on the meaning of Scripture, from the way in which it was understood by the primitive church. But we hold that Dr Young has equally excluded himself from using any argument to the opposite effect. For him to do so would be to argue in a circle; as it cannot on his own shewing be made out that the Fathers do not teach the doctrine, without assuming the very point to be proved, that it is not taught in the New Testament.

But, after all, our readers may be inclined to complain, with all this discussion we have heard nothing of what is Dr Young's own view of the atonement, which he wishes to put in the place of the doctrine of satisfaction. Well, the fault of this, if there be any, must rest with Dr Young. It was our wish and purpose to have criticised rather his own positive doctrine than his objections to ours; but really in all his book there is so little of direct positive statement of his own belief, and he is so continually gliding off, when we would expect some full exposition of what he regards as the true view of Christ's death, into objections against the evangelical doctrine, that we have not been able fairly to grapple with his own view, and are inclined to suspect either that it will not stand very close inspection, or that after all his purpose is merely negative, and he is content with pulling down the edifice he disapproves of, without putting anything in its stead. We must endeavour, however, before we close, to put before our readers as well as we can what Dr Young does hold; and we suspect it will be found that, to some extent, both of these things are true; for his system consists far more of negations than of assertions, and in so far as there is anything positive in it, that is not in the evangeli-

cal system as well, it will not stand examination for a moment. It is with sincere grief that we say it, but we are constrained to say, that Dr Young's view of the work of Christ is nothing but the lowest and barest Socinianism. He goes much further than Maurice and Kingsley in the Church of England; for he regards the work of Campbell on the Atonement, which they, we believe, recommend as a good statement of their views, as adhering to the central idea of the scholastic atonement, and, consequently, as being, with all the beauty he allows to it, a mere illusion. (See his note at p. 312.) We fancy his meaning is, that the central idea of the scholastic atonement, as he calls it, is that of Christ having rendered or offered something to God, and his work and death having had some effect on his relations and dealings with us as well as on ours with him. The less extreme of the Broad Church party in the Church of England, amid much that is obscure and hazy in their language, seem to hold, or at least to wish to hold, so much of the old doctrine as to ascribe some such purpose and effect to the work of Christ, however difficult they find it to bring out what it is; our author has no scruple in repudiating the idea, as entirely as did Socinus, and ascribing even less to the death of Christ than that great heresiarch did. The only purpose of the incarnation and life and death of Jesus was, according to Dr Young, to destroy sin in the souls of men, to turn men from sin and bring them back to God. It was not a sacrifice offered to God by the man Christ Jesus, as the one Mediator between God and men, it was a sacrifice "made by God for men, wholly and solely made by God for men, and for sin, in order that sin might be for ever put down and rooted out of human nature. This stupendous act of divine sacrifice was God's instrument of reconciliation and redemption, God's method of conquering the human heart, and of subduing a revolted world and attaching it to his throne—pure love, self-sacrificing love, crucified, dying love!" (p. 313). No doubt he can clothe his view with a great deal of eloquent and impressive language, and with a great deal of beautiful sentiment, more perhaps than the old Socinians were wont to display; yet, after all, we question very much whether his opinions of the work of Christ are really a whit more elevated than theirs; nay, in some respects they appear to us to be even less so. Socinians are wont to dwell much on the mercy of God as manifested in the free forgiveness of sins, and in this they certainly do assert a great and vital truth, though they have not, as they imagine, an exclusive possession of it. But our author's theory of spiritual laws seems to us really to leave no room for forgiveness at all in

the divine government. He argues that satisfaction to God's law and justice is not needed, not on the ground on which the Socinians put it, that the law need not be enforced and that the penalty may be remitted as freely as a creditor may forgive a debtor, but on the ground that the law executes itself, and cannot be altered or evaded. The claims of justice, he says, "cannot be set aside for a moment, and precisely for this reason, they never require and never can admit of a supplementary satisfaction from any quarter whatever. The righteous verdict of Heaven against all moral evil is in every instance carried out inexorably. As surely as a soul sins, in that moment it dies morally, that is, it begins to die, and in the degree in which it sins, it begins to die. Even where a new divine life has afterwards been enkindled within it, and has proved itself the stronger power, so long as sin remains, and to the extent to which it remains, death, moral death, never ceases to mingle its poison with the breath of a higher life. There is no possibility of defrauding and dishonouring eternal justice, no possibility of setting aside its unalterable sentence" (p. 137). When sin ceases, according to this view, punishment ceases, and justice ceases to have any further claim against the sinner. But if this be so, where is the grace of forgiveness, what mercy, what favour, what goodness is there in it if it be an act of pure justice? If the moment the prodigal returned, or rather the moment he came to himself and resolved to return, justice ceased to have any claim upon him for his departure and estrangement from his father's home, then his father could not but receive him as an act of simple justice; there could be no grace in overlooking and pardoning past offences which he could not justly resent and punish had he pleased. In fact, Dr Young's theory really leaves no room for forgiveness at all. All that God does or can do for the salvation of men, is to strike a death-blow at sin in their hearts, and turn and attach them in love to himself and his law; and to secure this end is the great and only purpose of the incarnation and life and death of Christ. There is, doubtless, here, abundant scope for enlarging, as Dr Young delights to do, on the infinite love of God, but there is no room for what is properly called mercy; for while God is regarded as turning man to himself, and so saving him from his sin, he is not represented as in any true sense forgiving him. Of this our author seems to be half-conscious himself, for when he says, (p. 140) "we have already proved, that in the divine redemption sin is not forgiven merely, but is literally, though gradually, killed in the soul"; as if sensible that he has hardly a right to that *merely*, he goes on to

correct or improve his statement as follows:—"It would be strictly true to say that it is always first struck at in order that it may be thoroughly destroyed, and that only in so far as it is killed and cast out of the nature, is it ever really done with and passed by;" thus explaining away into vagueness the idea of forgiveness. We accept the latter statement as the more correct expression of his theory; and we claim the former as the rightful property of the evangelical system alone. For we not only admit, but strongly assert all that Dr Young has said of the necessity of sin being destroyed in the soul, and the sinner turned to God; and of the power and influence and design of the work of Christ to effect this, we think we can hold these at least as fully as he can; we only demur to this being represented as the sole and exclusive purpose of the work of Christ. We would welcome Dr Young with all our heart, as a defender of truth, and helper to a right improvement and advance of theology, if he would be content to devote his energies and powers to deepen the foundations and enlarge the compass of this side of the edifice of divine truth; but how can we do so if he insists, in the first place, in pulling down every other part of the building? With almost everything positive in his book, with the exception of his theory of spiritual laws, we cordially agree; it is only from his negations that we feel ourselves constrained to differ. This is indeed almost universally the case with teachers of error, as is very well put by Dr Hodge, with whose words we close:—"All error, and especially all effective and therefore dangerous error, is partial truth. The human mind was formed for truth, and so constituted that only truth can exert permanent influence upon it. But the truth revealed in the Scriptures is so many-sided in its aspects, and so vast in its relations, and our habits of thought because of sin are so one-sided and narrow, that, as a general fact, the mind of any church in any single age fails to take in practically and sharply more than one side of a truth at a time, while other aspects and relations are either denied or neglected. A habit of unduly exalting any subordinate view of the truth, at the expense of that which is more important, or of over-looking, on the other hand, some secondary aspect of it altogether, is certain, after a time, to lead to a reactionary tendency, in which that which had been too much exalted shall be brought low, and that which has been abased shall be exalted. This principle is abundantly illustrated throughout the entire history of theological speculation, as in the ever repeated oscillations between the extremes of Sabellianism and Tritheism as to the Trinity, of Eutychianism and Nestorianism as to the person of Christ,

and in the history of speculations on the doctrine of redemption. Every prominent heresy as to the nature of the Atonement, . . . embraces and emphasises on its positive side an important truth. The power, and hence the danger of the heresy, resides in that fact. But, on the other hand, it is a heresy, and hence an evil to be resisted unto death, because it either puts a subordinate principle into the place of that which is central and fundamental, or because it puts one side of the truth for the whole, denying or ignoring all besides the fractional truth presented. It is plainly the policy as well as the duty of the defenders of the whole truth, not only to acknowledge the truth held on the side of their opponents, but to vindicate the rights of the perfect system as a whole, by demonstrating the true position and relation of the partial truth admitted, in the larger system of truth denied. By these means we double the defences of orthodoxy, by bringing into contribution all that is true, and therefore all that is of force in the apologies of error."—(*The Atonement*, pp. 17, 18.) For a full discussion of the subject, with reference to the views of Dr Young among other modern writers, we refer our readers to the work of Dr Hodge.

J. S. C.

ART. VI.—*Tischendorf on the Gospels.*

Origin of the Four Gospels. By CONSTANTINE TISCHENDORF, Professor of Theology in the University of Leipsig. Translated under the Author's sanction, by WILLIAM L. GAGE. From the Fourth German Edition, Revised and greatly Enlarged. London: Jackson, Walford, & Hodder. 1868.

IN this little volume, we have another "chip from a German workshop," on a question which appears to be interminable. The amount of literature suggested to the mind of the Biblical scholar by its title, is so varied and voluminous, as to defy enumeration. Names such as those of Eichhorn, Schleiermacher, and many others nearer our own day, at once occur to him as those of men who have laboured at the solution of this problem; while behind these again, there are multitudes of earlier scholars, such as Michaëlis and Griesbach, who struggled, with might and main, on the same arena. The Gospel question has indeed been a perfect godsend to the theologians of Germany. It has furnished them with an exhaustless subject for that

learned, hazy, and often utterly inconclusive wrangling in which, above all others, they delight. Were the controversy once finally settled, one of the great objects of existence would, in their case, have disappeared. But, as matters stand, the stream of publications on the subject flows on from generation to generation, and it seems as if we might say regarding it, as of the Horatian river—

“*Labitur et labetur in omne volubilis ævum.*”

This work of Tischendorf, however, does not deal with the problem of the Gospels in the manner or for the purpose apt to be suggested by its English title. The translator has adopted that title on his own responsibility, and by doing so, he has excited expectations which the work was never intended to fulfil. The original German title, “*Wann wurden unsere kanonische Evangelien verfasst?*” (*When were our canonical Gospels composed?*) really sets forth the one aim and object of Tischendorf in this volume. It takes no account of the relations of the Gospels to each other. It makes no attempt to explain the striking coincidences and equally striking diversities of the synoptics. It says not a word as to the marked contrast between both the style and matter of St John's Gospel, and those of the first three Evangelists. Its one purpose is to fix the comparatively early date of all the four Gospels, in opposition to those critics who would project them into the second century. And this being so, we cannot but regret that the English translator has given a title to the work which suggests a far more comprehensive and exhaustive treatment of the Gospel problem than is attempted, or than was at all designed, by the learned and distinguished author.

Restricting our view, then, to the one object at which Tischendorf professes to aim in this work, we have to inquire how far it has been accomplished. And we need have no hesitation in saying, that abundantly satisfactory evidence is produced to shew that the Gospels could have been no product of the second century. In fact, this has been demonstrated so often, that to do it over again, seems little better than a work of supererogation. Nor can we say that Tischendorf has succeeded in setting the matter in any very new or striking light. His method is strangely confused. In the opening pages, we are presented with quotations from Irenæus and Tertullian; further on, we find the reasoning directed to the writings of the Apostolic Fathers; then we are confronted with the heretical literature of the second century; and last of all, we get back again to Barnabas, Papias, and other early writers. The style, too, is heavy,

and the whole argumentation, from its looseness, leaves no very decided impression upon the mind. Tischendorf is evidently not quite at home in dealing with those questions which are discussed in this volume. He has here stepped beyond that magical circle in which he is an acknowledged master, and his wand is waved in vain. His *forte* is palæography, and not historical criticism.

There are just two facts which have struck us forcibly in the perusal of this work; and both must be regarded as of primary importance. They are of a nature which must attract the deepest interest of every one familiar with the controversy which has been carried on respecting the canon of Scripture, and they will both be strictly canvassed. We earnestly trust that further investigation will only substantiate what Tischendorf here suggests regarding them.

The first has reference to the external evidence which is available in proof of the apostolic origin of the fourth Gospel. No question in sacred criticism has given rise to more earnest or protracted discussion than this. It has been debated at great length by the German theologians, and only last year an elaborate work appeared in our own country on the question.* Most investigators on the Continent have admitted, even while accepting in some memorable cases, such as those of Credner and Ewald, the apostolic origin of the Gospel, that the external evidence is exceedingly scanty. And our last English inquirer has deemed that evidence next to nothing, so as to come, on this and other grounds, to the conclusion that the apostle John could not have been the author of the fourth Gospel.

In these circumstances, any additional scrap of outward testimony is simply invaluable. We believe, indeed, that there is not the possibility of a doubt that St John was the writer of that precious Gospel which bears his name. Whatever difficulties may be started against such an affirmation, they are multiplied a thousandfold by the refusal to accept of it. If not John, who else? Where is the man to be looked for among the scribblers of the early part of the second century, who could have produced such a singularly sublime, vivid, and satisfying representation of our Lord and Saviour? And if not John, how did such men as Irenæus and Tertullian come so positively to ascribe it to him? As every one knows who is acquainted with their writings, the

* We refer to a volume entitled, "An Attempt to ascertain the Character of the Fourth Gospel: especially in its Relation to the Three First." By John James Tayler, B.A., Member of the Historico-Theological Society of Leipsic, and Principal of Manchester New College, London. Williams & Norgate. 1867.

Johannine origin of the fourth Gospel is continually referred to by them as an unquestionable fact. And as we know that Irenæus wrote his great work "Against Heresies" in the episcopate of Eleutherus, that is, between A.D. 182 and A.D. 188, we have this eminent father bearing explicit testimony to the fourth Gospel as John's, in the last quarter of the second century. He, and the heretics whom he refuted, were alike agreed as to this fact. It was an accepted point by the whole Christian world. And this one argument is to our mind conclusive, that the gospel in question could not possibly have sprung into existence from some anonymous source, about the beginning of that century, the end of which found its apostolic origin so universally acknowledged; and that, therefore, the external evidence, even if not carried beyond Irenæus, guides us inevitably to St John as its author. But it is certainly somewhat remarkable, that we should not have earlier testimonies to this wonderful fourth Gospel. We find, indeed, the harmony of Tatian testifying by its title, *Diatessaron*, to the existence of four, and only four, accepted Gospels in his day, that is, a little after the middle of the second century. But there is no reference to St John as the author of the fourth Gospel previous to that date, and no certain quotation from it in the writings, either of Justin Martyr or the apostolic fathers. Coincidences of thought and expression, sometimes so striking as almost of necessity to suggest familiarity with the work, may be traced, but that is all that can in fairness be said.

One slight foothold has indeed been found in a statement made respecting Papias. Eusebius tells us of that ancient witness (who lived and wrote in the first quarter of the second century), that "he made use of proofs from the first epistle of John." Now, as every one admits that the epistle referred to and the fourth gospel proceeded from the same writer, we are led to infer from the above statement regarding Papias, that the author of the gospel bearing the name of John could not have lived at a later date than the early part of the second century. But, still, we are told by the English critic above mentioned, that "the language of Eusebius furnishes no certain proof that Papias knew the apostle John to be the author of the epistle," and thus we are debarred from the corollary which would follow from such a conclusion, that he was also the author of the fourth Gospel.

It is in this position of affairs that Tischendorf's new fact comes in to decide the question. Strictly speaking, indeed, the fact is not new. It appears to have been published to

the world before, but, by a most singular fate, to have been allowed to sink again into oblivion. The following are the words to which Tischendorf refers to the point soliciting our attention :—

“ It is,” he says, “ a genuine satisfaction to know that there has recently been brought to light a work printed long ago, but quite forgotten, in which Papias and his book give direct testimony in behalf of the Gospel which is assaulted under the protection of his name. It is a prologue to the Gospel of John, in a Latin manuscript of the Vatican (leaf 244), which, by a note in an old hand, is traced back to the possession of the Bohemian Duke Wenceslaus (*iste liber creditur fuisse Divi Venceslai Ducis Boemiæ*), and which, according to the appearances of the writing, dates from the ninth century. It is now designated, Vat. Alex., No. 14.* The prologue discloses that it was composed prior to the time of Jerome, and begins with the words, ‘ *Evangelium johannis manifestatum et datum est ecclesiis ab johanne adhuc in corpore constituto, sicut papias nomine hieropolitanus discipulus johannis carus in exotericis id est in extremis quinque libris retulit.*’ There can be no stronger testimony than this, that Papias did give evidence in behalf of John’s Gospel. The further purport of the prologue is, with all its brevity, rich in surprising facts. That it sprang from the works of Papias seems, however, on more grounds than one, to be doubtful ; and on this account the credibility of the other matters which it communicates cannot be put on the same footing with the first.”—(Pp. 199, 200.)

Here is indeed news for Biblical scholars. In all our reading we have never before met with the slightest reference to this statement of Papias. Westcott, in his comprehensive work on the canon, makes no allusion to it ; nor does Credner, Bleek, or any other of the recent German writers, either on the canonical books in general, or on St John’s Gospel in particular. We long for more information, and clearer explanations, respecting this extraordinary passage. The words of Tischendorf, quoted above, if properly translated, are not quite satisfactory. We cannot make out from them exactly what degree of authority he thinks should be assigned to this prologue. A note which is subjoined only still further confuses, instead of clearing up the matter.†

* Tischendorf adds in a note :—“ During my recent visit to Rome (March 1866), Cardinal Petra, the learned Benedictine, called my attention to this manuscript. Yet Cardinal Jos. Mar. Thomasius had already given place to the prologue accompanying it in his collections (*Opp. omnia*, tom. i., Rome, 1747, p. 344), where Dr Aberle of Tübingen had noticed it, and learnedly discussed it in the first number of his *Quarterly*, 1864, p. 1–47.”

† To give the reader all the satisfaction at present in our power respecting the important point referred to above, we subjoin Tischendorf’s additional remarks. “ It is further stated,” he says, “ *Disscripsit vero evangelium dictante Johanne recte.* That the writer of this prologue wanted that this should be understood of John, the prologue prefixed to the Greek *Catena* text to John

But it would seem that, while doubtful about other statements contained in the prologue, he has no hesitation as to its embodying a distinct affirmation on the part of Papias as to St John's having been the author of the fourth Gospel. And that being so, we are led at once to some most important conclusions.

It has often been argued, that because Eusebius quotes a passage from the lost work of Papias bearing on the origin of the Gospels of St Matthew and St Mark, while he says nothing as to St John's Gospel, that portion of the New Testament could not have been at all known to the ancient Bishop of Hierapolis. The reply to this obviously is, that an argument *ex silentio* is always of the most doubtful character. Eusebius, in the familiar passage (Hist. Eccl. iii. 89), may have had no intention of quoting any statement regarding St John's Gospel from the book of Papias, even though having it staring him in the face. It was what the *presbyter* John had told Papias that alone he apparently meant to abstract, and it certainly would not be from such a source that Papias would derive any information respecting the fourth Gospel. The reticence of Eusebius, therefore, on the point in question, is very far from proving that Papias did not refer in his work, of which unfortunately we know so little, to St John as having been the author of that Gospel which still passes under his name.

But if the statement quoted above from the lost work of Papias is really a genuine one, then the tables are completely turned upon those who have claimed the ancient Bishop of Phrygia as, by his silence, virtually on the side of those who deny the apostolic origin of the fourth Gospel. He is expressly declared, in the extract given above, to have related in his lost work that "the Gospel of John was manifested and given to the churches by John while still living in the body." If this be an authentic statement of Papias, it is the most important contribution which has, for long, been made to the external evidence for the fourth Gospel, and must, indeed, completely settle the question.

It is necessary, however, to be extremely cautious in admitting such passages as of historical worth, until they have been thoroughly investigated. A curious illustration of this is found in another reference, which was supposed to have been discovered, to this very Papias. Grabe fancied he had found a testimony to the fourth Gospel by Papias,

and edited by Corderius proves, which runs thus: ὑπαγόρευσε (sic) το εὐαγγ. τῷ ἰδυτοῦ μαθητῇ Παπια ἐν βιάτῳ τῷ ἱεραπολίτῃ. It is clear that this traditional statement is not to be reconciled with Eusebius."

in a fragment of that writer's work, contained in a manuscript belonging to the Bodleian Library. He accordingly published it as such, and it is reprinted by Routh in his "Reliquiæ Sacræ," as the eleventh existing fragment of Papias. But it turns out to belong to another Papias altogether, and one who has no weight in determining the controversy as to St John's Gospel. "The Latin passage," says Westcott (Canon, p. 65), "containing a reference to the Gospel which is published as a fragment of 'Papias' by Grabe and Routh (p. 11), is taken from the 'Dictionary' of a mediæval Papias quoted by Grabe upon the passage, and not from the present Papias. The 'Dictionary' exists in MS. both in Oxford and Cambridge. I am indebted to the kindness of a friend for this explanation of what seemed a strange forgery." While, therefore, strongly impressed with what seems the value of that new testimony to the Johannine origin of the fourth Gospel, which has been brought forward afresh by Tischendorf, we desiderate clearer and fuller information regarding the contents and history of the manuscript in which it is found, before expressing a confident opinion as to its genuineness and importance.

There is still another passage, generally supposed to be derived from the writings of Papias, which seems to contain a loose quotation from the fourth Gospel. It is found in Irenæus "Against Heresies," v. 36, 2, and is as follows:—
 "And as the presbyters say, they who have been proved worthy of life in heaven shall then (at the consummation of all things) go thither, that is, into heaven; others shall safely enjoy the delights of paradise, and others shall possess the splendour of the city; but God shall everywhere be seen, even as they who see him shall be worthy. This distinction of dwelling (they said) exists between those who brought forth an hundredfold, those who brought forth sixtyfold, and those who brought forth thirtyfold; some of them (as has been said) shall be received into heaven, others shall live in paradise, and others shall dwell in the City, and (the elders taught) that it was for this reason the Lord said, that 'in the presence of His Father (Lat. *apud Patrem*; Græc. *ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρὸς μου*) there are many mansions.'

It scarcely admits of any doubt that we have in these words an express quotation from John xiv. 2. And this, be it observed, not as made by Irenæus, who, on countless occasions brings forward passages from the fourth Gospel, but by those *elders* to whom he refers. Who these may have been we cannot positively say; but it is clear that they must have lived at a very early date in the history of the church. Probably sometimes Pothinus, the predecessor of Irenæus in

the see of Lyons, may be intended; but, quite as likely, Papias or Polycarp may occasionally be the person or persons quoted. In the present instance, Westcott and others believe that Papias is referred to, because the passage is supposed to savour of his peculiar style of exposition.* Tischendorf also inclines to this view, and remarks upon the passage as follows:—

“ Before leaving Papias, we must revert to one source of evidence in favour of John’s Gospel, which Irenæus (v. 86, 2) cites even from the lips of the presbyters, those high authorities of Papias. And on this account they say that the Lord used the expression, ‘In my Father’s house are many mansions’ (John xiv. 2). As the presbyters put this expression in connection with the degrees of elevation granted to the just in the city of God, in paradise, in heaven, according as they bring their thirty, sixty, or a hundredfold from the harvest, so nothing is more probable than that Irenæus borrowed this whole expression of the presbyter, together with the portraiture already referred to of the kingdom of a thousand years, from the work of Papias. Whether it comes from that source, however, or not, on every ground the authority of the presbyters stands higher than that of Papias; it takes us back unquestionably to the close of the apostolical period. In what way, and with what machinery, the noted men with whom unbelief becomes an art, and whose very efforts to propagate it are laboured at with artistic ingenuity, will be able to set aside this evidence in support of John’s Gospel, and, together with the testimony of the presbyters, that of Papias in the Latin prologue to John, is not apparent to me; yet I do not doubt that the skill which has defied all efforts to baffle it as yet, will be able to meet and overcome even this obstacle.”—(P. 201.)

This paragraph is clumsily expressed; it is indeed marked by such confusion, that, as in several other parts of the work, we suspect some degree of mistranslation.† But the reasoning is thoroughly sound, whether the passage in question be ascribed to Papias, or to presbyters of still more ancient date. A clear quotation from St John’s Gospel can be traced to the early part of the second century. And this fact should be pressed (though it is needless to adopt the sarcastic tone of Tischendorf in doing so), upon the attention of hostile critics. It may be mentioned that Mr Tayler, a Unitarian scholar in this country, author of the recent work

* The reader may compare Fragment IV. of Papias, in *Ante-Nicene Library*, i., 443.

† We fear the translator has done his work in a somewhat hurried fashion. Only on this ground can we account for such mistakes as “*Shepherds*” (p. 228) for the title of the well-known work of Hermas, and for Tatian being spoken (p. 280) as having written “*Addresses to the Heathen*.” We must protest also against such absurd American spellings as *defense*, &c., which disfigure the volume.

on St John's Gospel already mentioned, never once refers to this citation from the presbyters made by Irenæus, though professing carefully to collect and consider all that is to be found in ancient authorities, which can be supposed to countenance the early date and apostolic origin of the fourth Gospel.

We come now to notice briefly the second remarkable statement which occurs in the volume of Tischendorf under consideration. It has reference to the work known as "The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs." Few of our readers probably know much of this strange production. It has, in fact, been greatly neglected, not only in this country, but also in Germany. A striking proof of the little attention it has received is found in the fact, that it was not even named in the Prospectus of Messrs Clark's "Ante-Nicene Christian Library." It will doubtless be included in that very complete series of translations of the early writings of the church, but it has not yet appeared, nor has it even been named as preparing for publication. More wonderful still, it has hitherto remained almost unnoticed by German scholars. No modern edition of it has appeared from the pen of any one of them. No dissertations regarding it, that we are aware of, have been recently written by them. It remains almost a virgin subject, untouched by the hand of critics, awaiting in primitive freshness the loving researches of any one who may honour it with his attentions. But is the document which has been thus generally neglected worthy of any other treatment, and will it repay any labour which may be expended upon it? These questions are very natural, and they are abundantly answered by the following few words of Tischendorf (if, indeed, these words can be made good), that the time when these "Testaments" were written, "*can scarcely be set later than the close of the first or the opening of the second century.*" If this be true, we find to our astonishment that we have a long work, preserved in its original Greek, which at once takes rank with the very earliest remains of Christian literature. Only the Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians can, with certainty, be dated before it. The Epistle of Barnabas cannot be placed earlier than the end of the first quarter of the second century. That of Polycarp probably dates about the middle of the same century. The Epistles of Ignatius, if any of them be authentic, are to be placed in the first or second decade of the second century, but it seems hopeless to determine how far they have been interpolated and corrupted, granting that they are not entirely the offspring of fraud and forgery. The "Shepherd" of Hermas probably belongs to the second

quarter of the second century. The anonymous letter to Diognetus may be placed about the beginning of the century, and the fragments of Papias, which have been preserved, are taken from a work written some three or four decades later.

But if the statement quoted above from Tischendorf is well founded, we can add a new and most important witness to the scanty extant literature of the period. This will indeed prove a witness worth all the rest put together. A single fact is sufficient to put this point in a vivid and impressive light. The "Testaments" allude to *almost every book* of the New Testament. On this very ground, apparently, they have been deemed unworthy of serious investigation. Tischendorf refers to a critical commentary on the work published by J. Nitzsch in 1810, in which the following significant remark is made respecting the author of one of the "Testaments":—"Si ante casum Hierosolymorum floruisset, hunc] non tam diserte indicasset; sin omnino sæculo primo, non cognovisset ad quos fere omnes allusit *Nori Testamenti libros.*"

Tischendorf rightly objects to such *à priori* logic; and indeed foregone conclusions of this kind have operated greatly to the prejudice of truth in regard to both the New Testament books themselves, and the early Christian literature immediately following. But Tischendorf has an arduous task before him in seeking to vindicate and uphold the startling opinion as to the date of the "Testaments," to which he has committed himself. It is satisfactory to know that he is actively engaged in the matter. He tells us, in a note appended to the statement quoted above, regarding the time at which "The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs" were composed: "For the purpose of superseding Grabe's extremely imperfect edition of this important work, I have long been making the requisite preparations in the English and French libraries. It was my good fortune to discover, in 1844, an entirely unknown manuscript bearing on this matter, in the Island of Patmos." We shall look forward with the greatest interest to his promised edition of the "Testaments." We hope he will be able to make good the opinion he has ventured to express as to their date, but, in the meantime, our hope is mingled with not a little incredulity. We scarcely think it possible to make out their claim to any earlier date than the middle, or latter part, of the second century.

The "Testaments" purport to be the last words of the twelve patriarchs, the sons of Jacob, addressed by them, just before their death, to their children, and, in the two cases of

Reuben and Joseph, to their brethren. They belong to the same class of writings as the "Sibylline Oracles," so often quoted by the fathers from the days of Justin Martyr downwards. Their object was to cast the gospel history into a prophetic form. They were thus precluded from making any direct quotations from the books of the New Testament; but we have noticed in them unmistakeable allusions both to the Gospels, the Pauline Epistles, and the Apocalypse. Tischendorf's new edition of this little-known work, even should he have to modify somewhat the opinion he has expressed respecting its date, will be a most important contribution to sacred literature.

As to the general question of the date of the Gospels, critical opinion, with some rare exceptions, seems deliberately and decisively settling down into the conclusion that they must all have been composed before the end of the first century. Renan's admissions on this point are well known. And the more the works of the earliest Christian writers are studied and compared with the books of the New Testament, the more certain does it appear that these latter could not possibly have been coëval with the former. The Gospels must be veritable histories, and cannot, on purely scientific grounds, be regarded as myths. As Mr Row has acutely remarked in his recent work, entitled "The Jesus of the Evangelists," "They bear the stamp, not of the mind of the disciples, nor even of those who must have assisted at their oral transmission, but of the mind of the Master. We discover no foreign elements. They belong exclusively to one type of thought and feeling, while they present a marked difference from every other which has been invented by man. We discern in them no indications of the impress of different schools of thought, or of the presence of a disciple who thought that he could improve on the teaching of his Master" (p. 422).

One of the very best means of confirming faith in the divine origin of the Gospels, and the whole New Testament, is to familiarise the mind with those remains of the second century, alongside of which the canonical writings are supposed by some to have arisen. When this is done, the mind cannot but feel that the books of Scripture stand alone, that they are *sui generis* both as regards character and contents. It may be truly affirmed of every one of these writings, that, when compared with the very best of the remains of the second century, it is "velut inter ignes luna minores"; and the conclusion to which reason thus leads us is, that they must all have been written by men who enjoyed that special

gift of divine inspiration graciously accorded by God to the primitive Church.

It is interesting to note, though just what was to be expected, how every new fact that is brought to light tends to confirm the authority of Scripture. Thus, by the recent discovery of the *Codex Sinaiticus*, containing, along with the whole New Testament, the Epistle of Barnabas in the original, it is found that the formula, "as it is written," applied to a quotation from St Matthew's Gospel (chap. iv.) is no interpolation, as had been suspected. While we possessed only the Latin version, "sicut scriptum est," might have been, and was supposed to have been, foisted in by the translator; but now with *ὡς γέγραπται* lying before us, there can be no further shadow of doubt that it was customary to quote the Gospels as inspired and authoritative Scripture, in the early part of the second century.

We must claim the liberty of remarking, before we part with this little volume of Tischendorf's, how strikingly it illustrates that almost total neglect of English works on sacred criticism exhibited by German theologians. Rarely do they refer to, if indeed they ever read, any production of our apparently Bœotian island. But, however far we may still be behind them, such a course is to do injustice to us, and to entail loss upon themselves. Thus, had Tischendorf been acquainted with Mr Westcott's admirable and exhaustive work on the canon, he would probably have felt that a thorough scholar had preceded him in traversing the field occupied by his present volume, and that his labour, after Westcott's, was really very much a work of supererogation. We must say, with all respect for the useful little treatise before us, that it is not to be compared for a moment, in regard to the special question which it handles, with the corresponding portion of Mr Westcott's full and masterly work. And we would humbly express the hope that, with such scholars as Westcott, Lightfoot, and others among us, there may, by and by, be something else than absolute ignorance displayed, or silent contempt evinced, with respect to English sacred literature, by our learned brethren on the Continent.

ART. VII.—Mr Gladstone's '*Ecce Homo*.'

Ecce Homo. By the Right Hon. W. E. GLADSTONE. Strahan & Co., Publishers, 56 Ludgate Hill, London. 1868.

THAT can be no ordinary book which, after having been long before the public, and reviewed in almost every periodical of any consequence, should yet seem to retain such interest and influence as to make it appear worthy of a lengthened discussion from the pen of so distinguished a man as Mr Gladstone. Such a notice must doubtless have the effect of lending to it increased importance; and, as Mr Gladstone's papers (which appeared at first in "Good Words," and are now published by Mr Strahan in a collected form) are written in the spirit of panegyric and warm defence, with a very small intermixture of sparing criticism, they may not improbably tend to weaken the force of what may have been said in condemnation of the book, and add to its supporters and admirers. It is of importance, therefore, that the real weight of the defence should be inquired into, and that its readers, biassed by the position and reputation of the author, should not thoughtlessly adopt views which may be erroneous, in however plausible a light they may be put.

We respect Mr Gladstone's character, and we appreciate his talents, but is the history of his opinions such as to justify any great confidence in, or deference to, his judgment in such matters? He is ever the ardent and enthusiastic advocate of whatever opinions he may embrace; and it has been his lot to have maintained, with equal earnestness, at different periods, views in literal opposition to one another. An honest change of conviction is not indeed to be deprecated, and should not be made the subject of reproach; but we cannot estimate very highly the deliberative faculty of the man with whom change is all-pervading. The revolution which has taken place in his political creed is well known, and it has been remarked that at one time he probably would have been amongst the last to have come forward as the apologist of such a book as "*Ecce Homo*." We trust this may not point to a revolution in his religious impressions, yet to be carried further, and that he, who can now write so favourably of a work, of an undoubtedly rationalistic character, may not make progress in the same direction. Be it not so; but in such a mind, could any be surprised at such a result?

This, however, by no means appears to be the character

of Mr Gladstone's present opinions, and his defence of "Ecce Homo" rests upon the assumption, that it may be calculated, as it appears to him, ultimately to subserve the cause of sound religious belief. This view is enforced and set forth with every advantage, as might be expected when in such hands. But, although what emanates from a gifted mind will generally be masterly and interesting, it is not always in an equal degree accurate. The qualifications which enable a man successfully to support and illustrate a thesis, are very different from those which fit him for the calm perception of truth; and we may sometimes be astonished and diverted at discovering some assumption, obviously fallacious in itself, maintained and embellished with ability. We remember reading an eloquent speech, in which it was gravely contended, that the idea of the oar was originally caught by observing the motion of the wing of a bird in the sky. Had it been necessary to have ascribed so simple an appliance to anything beyond the mechanical instinct possessed by most men, might not a thousand things on earth have supplied the suggestion? The speaker referred to, if we mistake not, was Mr Gladstone. It was remarked of him long ago, by Lord Macaulay, that his lively imagination, and his copious vocabulary, were detrimental to him as a speculator; and the same characteristics, though in a somewhat mitigated form, yet distinguish what proceeds from him. He appears, in some instances at least, too readily to adopt some view of a subject, and at once to apply the resources of his powerful and accomplished mind to establish it; and his language sometimes, while it becomes stately and high sounding, fails easily to convey a clearly defined sense.

But in what light, let us inquire, does Mr Gladstone regard "Ecce Homo," and what does he allege in vindication of it? He infers, from the statement of its author in the preface, that he wrote it for the satisfaction of his own mind; that his own views were unformed on the subject of it; and that "he felt his way and made his road as he went along." He admits that it is but a partial exhibition of that on which it professes to treat, and that it "approaches the character of our Saviour on the human side exclusively." (P. 21). But he contends that "such a mode of treatment, while open to no insurmountable preliminary objection, is one eminently suited to the religious exigencies of the present times" (p. 22); and that it is simply in accordance with that gradual development of divine truth which has been observed in its communication to man. The main portion of the first and second parts of the book are occupied in the opening out of the last point, and the third part is no more

than a collection of extracts from "*Ecce Homo*," accompanied with a few very brief observations upon them.

Thus what we have to consider may be presented under three heads:—First, The mode in which the truth of the Gospel, according to Mr Gladstone's view, was gradually imparted to the world; secondly, The appropriateness of reverting to such a method of communicating it now, in consideration of the peculiar disposition of men's minds with respect to religious belief; and, thirdly, How far "*Ecce Homo*" fulfils this condition, and on this ground is defensible.

In approaching the discussion of the first question, which fills about half the volume, Mr Gladstone points out difficulties and dangers which would exist, both as respects the Jew and the Gentile, and which had to be carefully guarded against. He assumes that "the central idea of the Christian system," which, as he conceives, was to be delicately and progressively unfolded, was "the mixed conception of the character and person of our Lord as divine and human" (p. 14). Is this assumption perfectly correct? or would it not be more proper to say, that the central idea of Christianity is our Lord, in his twofold nature, viewed as discharging the office of mediator?—To our view, this addition is requisite to complete the idea. Mr Gladstone, however, limiting himself to this personal view of Christ, observes that the conception of God tabernacling amongst men in a human form would not be new, either to the Jew or the Gentile, and that in consequence of this, considered in relation to the particular condition of each at the time of the advent of Christ, serious mischief might have arisen, had not his real character been imparted with great reserve and caution. The Jew, being under the power of Rome, would naturally expect his Messiah to appear as a great deliverer from such subjection; and had they been led as a nation to embrace Christ in this character, obviously in so doing they might have been brought into collision with the Roman power. This is but a familiar thought. We proceed to what will appear less so.

As the Jew mainly by prophecy had been led to look for a divine deliverer in human shape, so the Gentile, by a process peculiar to himself, had been habituated to a similar idea. There was "a form ready made in the mind of each," to use Mr Gladstone's words, "into which such an idea might drop" (p. 31). Mr Gladstone regards this idea in two lights, as "affording a facility on the one hand for the reception of the infant religion," and on the other, as "constituting a danger" to it. As Mr Gladstone has pre-

viously, rather more than two years since, expounded more fully the theory, which is here but slightly mentioned, in an address delivered before the University of Edinburgh, on "The Place of Ancient Greece in the Providential Order of the World," we are enabled to obtain a more correct conception of it than the present brief notice conveys.

We may have a confidence that Christ would be revealed to the world in the fulness of time, and that the condition of the world would be such as the divine wisdom saw to be most adapted for such a manifestation. Yet, as it is a question respecting which we have only our own inference and conjecture to guide us, it is one on which it becomes us to speculate with caution. Various writers have more or less in this spirit, endeavoured to point out in what the fitness of the period consisted, and how the events of history had tended to it. Mr Gladstone is somewhat bolder, and advances the theory, which, so far as we are aware, is his own, that the anthropomorphic element in heathen mythology,—in other words, that species of idolatry in which the god worshipped was represented under the human form,—was providentially designed to discipline and train the minds of men for the reception of the idea of a divine deliverer in the form of man. This may appear somewhat startling, but, we imagine, it will be fully borne out by reference to the address named.

"I submit to you," says Mr Gladstone (Address, pp. 19-22)," that the true *Preparatio Evangelica*, or the rearing and training of mankind for the Gospel, was not confined to that eminent and conspicuous part of it which is represented by the dispensations given to the patriarchs and the Jews, but extends likewise to other fields of human history and experience; among which, in modes, and in degrees, varyingly perceptible to us, the Almighty distributed the operations, preliminary and introductory, to his one great, surpassing, and central design for the recovery and happiness of mankind. So that, in their several spheres, some positive, some negative, some spiritual, some secular, with a partial consciousness, or with an absolute unconsciousness, all were co-operators in working out his will; under a guidance strong and subtle, and the more sublime, perhaps, in proportion as it was the less sensible.

"In the body of those traditions of primitive religion which are handed down to us in the Book of Genesis, and which I shall make no further apology for treating as records of great historic weight, there was manifestly included what I may term an humanistic element. It was embodied in the few but pregnant words which declared that the seed of the woman should bruise the serpent's head. The principle of evil was to receive a deadly shock in its vital part, and this at the hands of One who should be born into the very race that he would come to deliver.

“ The next observation I would submit is this : that there was no provision made, so far as we are aware, at any rate in the Mosaic system, for keeping alive this particular element of the original traditions, otherwise than as an anticipation reaching into the far distant future. . . . Let us now turn to the religion of the Hellenic race, and we shall find that, as a matter of fact, it appropriated to itself, and was intensely permeated by, that very anthropomorphic element which the Mosaic system was so especially framed to exclude, and to which the other religions of antiquity gave, in comparison, but a doubtful and secondary place.”

These extracts, we conceive, will make it clear what Mr Gladstone means when he speaks of the Greek anthropomorphism “supplying the Gentile with a form into which the idea of a divine deliverer, clad in the flesh, might drop.” As this view is put forward by one so eminent, and has at least the fascination of novelty, it may perhaps be worth while briefly to consider it.

Now, in the first place, it does not seem that the human mind requires any such education to accustom it to regard deity in association with the human form, but that in its untaught and unenlightened state, it is only too prone thus to view God, and that it rather needs to be educated to conceive of him as divested of any such form. We know that a child’s first conception of a Supreme Being is generally of this character. But a tendency thus to regard a higher power is not limited to children. A respectable writer on mythology, unbiassed by the thought of any position which he had to support or overthrow, speaks thus : “ Man is incapable of conceiving pure spirit, and he knows no form so beautiful or so perfect as his own, and none so well adapted to be the vehicle of mind. He naturally, therefore, fell into the habit of assigning a human form to his gods ” (Keightley’s *Mythology*, p. 4). To this disposition in men, doubtless, in addition to the influence of their actual contact with idolatry, is to be ascribed the reiterated prohibition to the Jews, of all idolatry, and the repeated admonition in Exodus, “ Ye saw no similitude on the day that the Lord spake unto you.”

More than this. Even as respects those who have been taught to view God, as he is revealed, as a pure spiritual existence, so great is their aptness in thought to see everything under a shape, so unable are they to rise, at least with any continuity of grasp, to the idea of pure spirit, that they can only contemplate it by aid of the ideas derived from form. “ Though we must not conceive of God,” to quote the words of Charnock, “ as of a human or corporeal shape, yet we cannot think of God without some reflection

upon our own being, . . . and though we would spiritualise our thoughts, and aim at a more abstracted and raised understanding, yet there will be some dregs of matter sticking to our conceptions. . . . Therefore God tempers the declaration of himself to our weakness and the condition of our natures" (Works, vol. i. p. 277, Nichol's ed.). Since then, such a form is ever ready to present itself in the mind of man, and it is only by an effort, which cannot be sustained, that he attains the idea of pure abstracted Deity, Mr Gladstone appears as performing a gratuitous labour, and assigning a preparation where none would be needed, in representing the anthropomorphic mythology as training mankind to admit the idea of God incarnate. It was unnecessary to suggest to men's minds the form Mr Gladstone speaks of, as it was there already.

But had it not been so, had there existed a repugnance in men to the association of the human form with the idea of a divine nature, and had it on this ground been desirable in order to dispose them to a reception of the gospel, that this conception should have been suggested to them, and that they should have become familiarised with it, the agency adduced by Mr Gladstone, we do not think, would have been a very appropriate one for the accomplishment of such an end. He admits that the old mythology was "sadly corrupt and sadly corrupting;" and, being so, how could it have been the vehicle of the pure abstracted "form into which might drop" what he regards as the central idea of the gospel, without bringing along with it its associated circumstances of corruption, the suggestion of principles false and debasing, and the practice of rites which were abominable? Mr Gladstone is sensible of this difficulty, but makes it subservient to the requirements of his present argument. "The form or matrix," he says (p. 31), "was itself deformed, and in receiving the idea, was but too likely to deprave and distort it." This consideration he adduces as a reason for the cautious and gradual development of the idea. "How terrible," he adds farther on, "would have been the consequences if the tidings of this new and greater Epiphany of a Divine Person had gone forth, so to speak, prematurely: that is to say, if our Lord had found his way into the catalogue of accepted divinities, before the deep and strong and even stern lines had been effectually drawn, which were to fix an impassable gulph between Christianity and the virulent corruptions that were now in the very heart's core of the popular system, and that it came to subdue and extirpate,"—(p. 36). This hardly appears reconcilable with what is asserted a little previously, "that the old

mythology had in the days of our Saviour ceased to be a religion at all." Certainly, as a system influencing the general and popular mind, it was by no means extinct at this time. We may learn this clearly from the history of the Acts, and from the Epistles; nor was it until an advanced period, towards the close of the fourth century, that it was finally overthrown; and its reign did not then terminate without leaving behind it very mischievous consequences. So far from being the pioneer of the gospel, the lofty mission which Mr Gladstone assigns to it, it has been regarded by historians of the church as having transmitted to it one of the grossest corruptions by which it has been disfigured and perverted. "Note ye that both St Jerome and Eusebius agree herein that these images came in amongst Christian men by such as were Gentiles, and accustomed to idols, and, being converted to the faith of Christ, retained yet some remnants of Gentility not thoroughly purged."*

Such a system was well calculated, by blending itself with Christianity, to detract from its purity; and in the degree in which it had become effete, as the more intelligent and thoughtful felt its emptiness and despised it, on Mr Gladstone's own principle, it must have proved an impediment in the way of the reception of the idea of deity incarnate, as it would inevitably create a strong prejudice against any form of belief thus coinciding with it. The philosopher who regarded with disdain the Jupiter, the Apollo, the Bacchus, and the Venus of the populace, seeing them apparently meet on the common ground of anthropomorphism, might not unnaturally view with similar feelings the Christ of the Gospel. Under such circumstances, the form in his mind, left by the idea of divinity residing under a human shape, would remain empty, and instead of being open to, and embracing a fresh occupant, would repel any such admission.

In the address which has been mentioned, Mr Gladstone refers, unapprovingly and unsympathisingly of course, to the severer view taken of heathen mythology by certain writers whom he names. But he might have included in his criticism the names of Moses, David, and St Paul, for they all spoke to the same purport. St Paul, writing to the Corinthians (1 Cor. x. 20), where he could not be referring to any other form of idolatry than that which Mr Gladstone had specially in view, says expressly, that "the things which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to devils;" and precisely similar assertions may be found in the Old Testament. Tak-

* Homily on Peril of Idolatry, part 2.

ing this view of Gentile idolatry, it would seem difficult to see it in the light of a sort of preliminary dispensation, in some sense running parallel with Judaism, and, with it, forming part of the rearing and training of mankind for the Gospel. Considering the question dispassionately, and in all fairness, it is hard to conceive how such a theory could for a moment have been seriously entertained in the face of the real probabilities and facts of the case. It had its origin surely in a lively fancy, and was formed into shape by a mind too apt hastily to adopt a view responding in some respects to what our natural sympathies might suggest, while it was readily able to place it in its most plausible light, and to overlook the insuperable objections which lay against it. Can the propounder of such a theory be regarded as a safe, or judicious, or a consistent guide in religious inquiry?

Mr Gladstone having pointed out the necessity which, for the reasons mentioned, he conceives existed for reserve and reticence in the first divulging of the fundamental doctrines of Christianity, proceeds to shew in what way it was practically carried out. He instances this first in the differences observable in the character of the books composing the New Testament, the synoptical Gospels presenting the most simple and rudimentary form, and the Acts, the Gospel of St John, the Epistles, and the Apocalypse, respectively offering a more advanced stage of Christian instruction.

He next reviews, with some minuteness, "the order and economy observed in the gospel narratives, and in our Lord's own acts and teaching, in making known to the world the religion he had come on earth to found" (p. 55); or, in other words, in declaring himself. What Mr Gladstone here notices is no doubt to some extent true, and most readers of the gospels must have felt that our Lord's character is not always placed in the same full light, that sometimes he utters himself with greater explicitness than at others, and that the gospel scheme is more distinctly and completely expounded to us after the ascension than it had previously been. But although, so far as regards the general idea of a development in the promulgation of the gospel, we allow Mr Gladstone to be correct, yet we cannot coincide with the details of his view of it, nor can we regard the manner and spirit in which he has treated it as fair and sound. On a careful survey of it, he appears to us more as aiming to make good his position, than as seeking, and open to accept, such conclusions as an unbiassed examination of the subject might suggest. What makes against him is unceremoniously and without any just reason put aside, or

lost sight of, and in endeavouring to support the view he advances, he is led sometimes to overstate what in a limited sense might be true; to draw large inferences from inadequate premises; and sometimes to allege palpable errors. These may seem strong assertions, but we doubt not that they will be justified by an investigation of the discourse before us. Mr Gladstone begins with the narrative of the three first Gospels which bears upon the personal history of our Lord, and in considering it, he sees fit to exclude from his view the history of the Birth and Infancy, the Baptism, the Temptation, and the Transfiguration. He does not name here the ministry of John the Baptist. He would, we presume, exclude it likewise, and for the same reason, "as forming no part of the public ministry of Christ." Mr Gladstone regards these as "those portions which bear principally upon the divinity of our Lord," and it may very well suit the purpose he has in view thus to eliminate them: but we submit that in estimating the import and force of our Lord's own disclosures of himself, we have no right to place out of our account what might previously have been imparted respecting him, and the views and impressions of him which in consequence might be more or less generally current. Could such events as those referred to have taken place without attracting much attention, and producing their impression in the opinion entertained of him whom they concerned? We speak not of the Temptation, and the Transfiguration; for the one was transacted in solitude, and the other before only three witnesses. But our remark holds as respects the events named which preceded these. Let us for a moment dwell upon them.

The birth of John the Baptist was remarkable. It had been announced by an angel, and when it occurred, in consequence of the peculiar circumstances attending it, we are told "that fear came on all that dwelt round about, and all these sayings were noised abroad throughout all the hill country of Judea: and all they that heard them laid them up in their minds, saying, What manner of child shall this be!" The birth of Jesus was still more extraordinary, was preceded by announcements far more solemn, was followed by the visit of the shepherds, "who made known abroad the saying which was told them concerning this child, so that all they that heard it wondered at those things which were told them by the shepherds;" by the visit of the wise men, whoever or whatever they might be, causing great consternation at Jerusalem, and leading to the slaughter of the children at Bethlehem. Such occurrences would not be forgotten. By some they would be fondly clung to with

devout and believing anticipations, and would excite wonderment and surmising in others. But however viewed, by very many they would be remembered. At the end of twelve years, another strange event, and of a public nature, took place. The child, so wonderfully announced, so wonderfully born, was found in the temple, conversing with the doctors, and astonishing all who heard him by the wisdom he displayed. This could not but be noticed, would become the subject of comment, and would revive, where it required to be revived, the remembrance of his birth, and the circumstances which distinguished it. For eighteen years the narrative is silent. The wondrous youth, whose person would be invested with a sacredness, which the gravity and wisdom of his deportment would serve to maintain, lived in privacy with his parents at Nazareth. But towards the close of this period commenced the preaching of John the Baptist. It was of a stirring character. He appeared not in the light of an ordinary moral or religious teacher. He had but little to say about himself, but he had much to say about another. He declared himself as the forerunner of the Coming One, and said that he was "the voice of one crying in the wilderness, make straight the way of the Lord, as said the prophet Esaias." It was as the herald, then, of the Lord that he described himself. He announced the "kingdom of heaven as at hand," and proclaimed, "He that cometh after me is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear." Looking upon Jesus, he exclaimed, "Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world." Jesus is at length baptised by him, the heavens open, and the Spirit descends; and John, we are told, "bare record, saying, I saw the Spirit descending from heaven like a dove, and it abode upon Him." At the baptism the heavenly voice had declared, "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased." John, witnessing to this, "bare record that Jesus was the Son of God."

The ministry of John the Baptist was not restricted to a few. "Jerusalem," we read, "and all Judea, and all the region round about, many Pharisees and Saducees, went out to him, and came to his baptism." So great was the interest excited, and such the views entertained of him, that "the people were in expectation, and all men mused in their hearts of John whether he were the Christ."

Thus, then, the herald had performed his office, its results had followed, and when the Greater One, who was announced, commenced his ministry, he would be no unknown personage. The testimony of the Baptist would be widely spread; some would be able to recall the wonders of his birth; and

many would have heard that he was then announced as a "Saviour, Christ the Lord," that he was to be "Immanuel, God with us."

We have thrown together these particulars, at the risk of tediousness, to make it evident that the people must have been very considerably leavened with opinions respecting Christ, when he publicly appeared amongst them. Owing to this, it would not in the same degree seem needful, as under other circumstances it might have been, that our Lord should openly make an avowal of what he claimed to be. He had but to accept and to establish the character which had been already assigned to him. And this appears an important consideration to bear in mind, in estimating the force and import of all that fell from our Lord. He made his public appearance before men under such circumstances as no man had ever appeared previously; and with such rumours and impressions afloat respecting him, it would be impossible for him to come in the light of a mere ordinary human teacher. If he did not always announce himself with distinctness, it may be partially explained by the fact, that his fame and his pretensions had gone before him; and in excluding a consideration of what preceded the ministry of Christ, Mr Gladstone is really excluding that without which no correct estimate of his ministry can be formed.

What has now been said applies to, and may be illustrated by, a reference to the sermon on the mount. Mr Gladstone says respecting it, that our Lord "asserted in it his authority as a teacher, but nothing more." But he *assumes* much more than this; and his expressions imply that he regarded his audience as viewing him in a different character. Such being the case, an explicit allusion to their impressions about him would be less to be expected than a tacit recognition of them, incidentally disclosing itself; and such we seem to have in the words, "Blessed are ye, when men shall revile you, and persecute you, and shall say all manner of evil against you falsely for my sake. Rejoice and be exceeding glad, for great is your reward in heaven; for so persecuted they the prophets which were before you." This is not the language of a mere teacher, or of a prophet. His auditors, when persecuted for his sake, are compared to the prophets of old, when suffering in the cause of Jehovah. To complete the parallel, then, by whom was the speaker represented? In connection with this, we recal the words towards the end of the sermon, "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven. Many will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied

in thy name? and in thy name have cast out devils? and in thy name done many wonderful works? And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you: depart from me, ye that work iniquity." Again, we ask, is this the style of a teacher, and nothing more than a teacher? May we not apply the principles above referred to as respects the impressions, which might be naturally prevalent, as to the character of our Lord, arising from the events which had preceded his own actual ministry, and which, at the time of the delivery of the sermon on the mount, at the close of the first, or commencement of the second, year of his ministry, might have received, in the minds of many, corroboration from his works? And are we not justified in supposing that, on this and other occasions, there would be underlying what fell from him, and often influencing its form, the tacit assumption that those whom he addressed regarded him, and had reason to regard him, as something more than mortal? Hence, coupled with his own innate majesty, the authority with which he spake; and hence, viewed in connection with the conviction resulting from his words and works, the acknowledgment, at different times extorted, in somewhat varied form, This is the Son of God.

We do not maintain that the impressions respecting the nature of Christ, now referred to, as extensively dispersed amongst the people, and the superstitions which would generally be associated with them, remained undisturbed. The facts of the narrative are against such a supposition. But the explanation is not difficult. The anticipations of the Jews generally respecting the Messiah, having assumed a false form, when they did not see their hopes realised, the belief which they had been willing to entertain would receive a serious check, and the claims of Jesus would be no longer admitted. But still the rumour had gone forth, and although owing to events not seeming to confirm it, it might lose somewhat of its interest and power, and, in consequence, he who was the subject of it would often be exposed to persecution and contempt; yet, on some occasions, when his words and his deeds carried conviction, transient, perhaps, in many cases, to the minds of those who heard or saw him, the result was a spontaneous recognition of its truth.

Assuming, then, the disposition of the Jewish mind with respect to our Lord, to a considerable extent to have been such as we have supposed, we might expect that what might proceed from him, implying an assertion of his own claims, would be in an oblique and indirect form, rather than in the form of open avowal; but that where his claims were openly disputed or rejected, he might, sometimes at least, be led

openly to declare them, or, in other instances, to instruct and reassure honest doubt. The gospel history, we imagine, will bear out this view. But at the same time, we acknowledge there was often a cautious reserve, together with a progress and development, in the teaching of Christ. Many reasons combined to render this necessary. Beyond the peculiar susceptibilities and prejudices of individuals, to which our Lord doubtless adapted himself, there existed the general attachments and feelings of the nation, who were not looking for *such* a Messiah, and who did not expect their religion of elaborate form to be superseded by a spiritual religion. On the one hand, there was a fear lest those who, influenced by the miracles which he wrought, were ready to acknowledge him as the Messiah, should seek to compel him to assert the character in accordance with their notions of it, and thus create confusion and mischief; and, on the other hand, lest his enemies should be provoked prematurely to rise against him, and seek his death before his appointed course had been fully run. For he had a work to do in supplying satisfactory proofs of his power and character, and in delivering a body of teaching, which throughout all ages might be for the necessary instruction and guidance of the church which he came to found. These reasons conspired to suggest an adaptation of the teaching of Jesus to the occasion, and to the receptive condition of his disciples; and it is especially observable with reference to his declaration of his approaching death and sufferings, which were so contrary to what they had anticipated in him, that to the last they were staggered by them.

But in this idea of a progress in the teaching of our Lord, there is nothing new, and it has been often observed. What distinguishes Mr Gladstone's view of it, as it seems to us, is that he has exhibited it in an exaggerated and extravagant form. Having put aside, unjustifiably, as we think, those parts of the history of our Lord which make strongly against him, he goes on to treat of that portion of it which his purposes admits, and he commences his task with singular incorrectness.

He refers especially to the injunction of secrecy upon the three apostles, who had witnessed the transfiguration, as supporting his view, and then adds, "Until after the transfiguration, that is, until a somewhat advanced period of our Saviour's ministry, he does not appear to have predicted, or indicated to them in any manner, his own impending death." It is in St Matthew xvii. 1-9, that we read the account of the transfiguration. In St Matthew xvi. ver. 21, we read, "From that time began Jesus to shew unto his disciples

how that he must go unto Jerusalem, and suffer many things of the elders, and chief priests, and scribes, and be killed, and be raised again the third day." A reference to St Mark and St Luke will shew that they agree with St Matthew in placing this prediction before the transfiguration. Mr Gladstone's assertion is strong, that "our Lord had not indicated in any manner his impending death," and is inconsistent with Matthew ix. 15, xii. 41, John ii. 19-21, iii. 14, vi. 51, which contain figurative intimations long prior to the transfiguration. He continues, in the next sentence, "The full and glorious confession of him by St Peter, Matt. xvi. 17-19, as the Son of the living God, has all the appearance of a great progression newly achieved in that ardent soul." But Peter had before confessed Christ as strongly and as ardently, John vi. 69. The disciples in the ship, including Peter, had uttered a similar acknowledgment, "Of a truth thou art the Son of God," Matt. xiv. 33; and Nathaniel, still earlier, John i. 49, "Rabbi, thou art the Son of God, thou art the King of Israel."

Mr Gladstone notices at some length the miracles of our Lord, and adduces, as establishing his point, the commands of secrecy laid in some instances upon the subject of the miracle, or upon those who had witnessed it. Of the particular miracles recorded, there are five in which men receive such an order; and as the injunction is thus partially and exceptionally given, we may be justified in concluding that there existed some special reason for it in each instance, either in the moral condition of the individuals concerned, or in the state of circumstances at the time, rendering it expedient; and it scarcely seems fair to insist upon it as countenancing such a general theory of development as Mr Gladstone is advocating. Admitting, as he does, that publicity was the rule of the miracles, the exceptions cannot properly be appealed to as illustrating his principle.

But he undertakes to state with what object the miracles of our Lord were wrought, and he limits this to the establishment of his character as a divinely sent human teacher. He appears to assume throughout that Christ commenced his ministry as a person unknown, having to vindicate a position and character for himself, and to be simply viewed by the people as his own declarations and his works might represent him; and he seems altogether to overlook the view which must have been entertained respecting him, and the expectations which must have been formed before he made his appearance. He speaks of the forerunner, but he ignores his work. We conceive, that so far as our Lord might sanction and allow what had been previously promul-

gated as to the nature of his mission, his works would be calculated to assert it for him. But perhaps he may himself be accepted as his own best witness as regards the end designed in his miracles. In the remarkable discourse in the latter part of the 5th chapter of St John's gospel, delivered at the commencement of the second year of Christ's ministry, in which the claim of divine nature and equality with God is made, referring to the evidences on which he based such assertions, he says (ver. 33), "Ye sent unto John, and he bare witness unto the truth. . . . But I have greater witness than that of John: for the works which the Father hath given me to finish, the same works that I do, bear witness of me, that the Father hath sent me." The miracles of Christ, then, were wrought to prove that he was divinely sent in such character as he assumed, whether in that or in any other discourse. Mr Gladstone maintains that he assumed no higher character than that of a teacher; but his mere acceptance of the character which the Baptist had ascribed to him, apart from any assertions of his own, implied very much more than this. Hence the danger, which it was needful to guard against, lest those who accepted him should band together openly to contend for his claims, in the light in which they interpreted them, and lest his enemies should proceed to extremities against him before the time appointed of the Father,—inasmuch as his miracles went to establish him in the estimation of the people, not as a teacher merely, but as the Christ. It was after the feeding of the five thousand that the design was entertained of taking him by force and making him a king. John vi. 15. It was after the raising of Lazarus that the "chief priests and Pharisees gathered a council, and said, What do we? for this man doeth many miracles. If we let him thus alone, all men will believe on him, and the Romans shall come and take away both our place and nation" John xi. 47, 48.

But our Lord not only thus performed miracles himself in support of his claim, he also commissioned others to do the same, and this transmission of his power was well fitted to exalt the conception, which the thoughtful at least might be disposed to form respecting his person. This was an important part of the work which the apostles were entrusted to execute, but it was not all. We agree with Mr Gladstone that both our Lord's ministry and theirs, while he was upon earth, were of a preparatory character, and in this respect resembled that of his messenger. This must have been the case, as the great events, which, taken in conjunction with

the nature of him who was primarily concerned in them, were to constitute the Gospel message, had not yet taken place. But Mr Gladstone, in referring to our Lord's instructions to the apostles and the seventy, on sending them out, avails himself of those portions which appear favourable to his design, and overlooks the rest. It is really a profound discourse, and unquestionably anticipates a far more advanced state of things than then existed; but in its spirit it was applicable, when our Lord spoke it, as it still applies to those who now are his ministers. What Mr Gladstone enforces respecting it is, that it is silent as regards the person of our Lord; and he would seem to imply that their announcement was to be restricted to the stereotyped form, "The kingdom of heaven is at hand." From the mere nature of the case, this could not be; and, if they were free to state anything beyond uttering these words, it must have been in the shape of enlargement and explanation, such as their own knowledge at the time would enable them to supply. But much more than this was clearly intended by Jesus. Words were to be suggested on emergencies by the Spirit (Matt. x. 20); and there is one passage in it singularly adverse to the view of cautious repression and holding back of truth, which Mr Gladstone is contending for, as being the habit of our Lord at the period in question,—“What I tell you in darkness, that speak ye in light; and what ye hear in the ear, that preach ye upon the housetops” (ver. 27). Our Lord's communications to them were not limited to declaring in so many words that the kingdom of heaven was at hand; neither therefore were their own in their preaching to be confined to it. And the words quoted would appear to suggest that, as publicity was the rule as regards the miracles, and secrecy the exception, so as regards the preaching both of our Lord and his apostles, the rule would be avowal, and silence only observed so far as the particular circumstances of the place or the time might require.

But there are two portions of the teaching of Jesus which present peculiar difficulties in the way of Mr Gladstone's view; the parables of the synoptic gospels, and the discourses in St John's gospel. In the former, he admits that our Saviour “fills a much higher place than that of a teacher, however divinely accredited” (p. 82), but he escapes from the suggested conclusion by observing, that “where the proper dignity and weight of the Redeemer in one of his high offices, namely, as a king, begins to be significantly conveyed, there is a veil interposed, as if to cast the scene into shadow” (p. 86). In reply to this, we will but quote the words of Archbishop Trench:—“However our Lord

may on one or more occasions have made use of this manner of teaching by parables, with the intention of withdrawing from certain of his hearers the knowledge of truths, which they were unworthy or unfit to receive ; yet we may assume as certain, that his general aim was not different from that of others who have used this method of teaching, and who have desired thereby to make clearer, either to illustrate or to prove, the truths which they had in hand " (Parables, p. 11). Thus, then, if in the conveyance of these truths, "a veil was interposed," it was a veil "which the sense shined through, like a bright sun through a thin eyelid," in the language of Jeremy Taylor, as quoted by Trench.

In the discourses recorded by St John, the personal character of our Lord comes out yet more fully and unmistakeably. The objection, therefore, must in some way be overcome. To effect this, the process of elimination is first resorted to. The last ten chapters are excluded, as containing the history of the Passion, the eleventh as referring to a period close upon the Passion, and the first four, as the discourses given in them were addressed to individuals. The difficulty is thus reduced to the six chapters, from the fifth to the tenth, and these are disposed of by asserting that the teaching contained in them was "delivered to no great number ; perhaps, too, within a limited sphere of time " (p. 100), and that it was not well received, and thus was of an exceptional nature. As respects the first assertion, the period over which the discourses extended was about twenty months, or nearly two years, the discourse in the fifth of St John being delivered at the opening of the second year of our Lord's ministry, and that in the tenth, about December in the third year. Of the intervening chapters, the sixth finds its place at the close of the second year, the seventh, eighth, and ninth, in the autumn of the third. The number of persons before whom these discourses were spoken is not very definitely stated, but there is no reason for supposing it limited. That in the sixth chapter was delivered at Capernaum, before at least a part of the multitude of five thousand which had been miraculously fed by Jesus on the preceding day, and the remainder of the discourses appear to have been delivered mostly in the temple. This, however, could suggest no ground for inferring that the audiences were small, as we read (chap. viii. 2), "Early in the morning he came again into the temple, and all the people came unto him ; and he sat down and taught them." But whether the audiences were large or not, they consisted to a considerable extent of Jews, who were hostile to our Lord, and who did not belong to the

"inner circle," as Mr Gladstone speaks, the favoured faithful few for whom the esoteric teaching was reserved.

This difficulty is met by the second assertion above referred to, that the discourses in question were not well received, and excited opposition, thus demonstrating that the teaching conveyed in them was of too advanced a character to be generally applicable, and must, therefore, have been different from that which was generally given. The cause of this opposition, so far as it existed, may more properly be suggested to us by the description of the audiences addressed than by the nature of our Lord's words. The true explanation is well supplied by Bishop Ellicott, who observes, that "in estimating the degree of reception that our Lord's teaching met with, we must carefully distinguish between the general mass of the people, whether in Judea or Galilee, which commonly heard him gladly (Mark xii. 37), and the pharisaical or hierarchical party, which both disbelieved themselves, and, commonly acting from Judea as a centre, readily organised co-operation in other quarters" (*Lectures on Life of our Lord*, p. 142, note).

It would be interesting to pursue this subject, and it might be shewn that in the synoptic gospels, contrary to what Mr Gladstone states, strong opposition was either actually manifested or implied (Luke iv. 29, Matt. x. 19); and that these discourses in St John, of which we have been speaking, were received with divided feelings, and, in a considerable degree, favourably. "There was much murmuring amongst the people concerning him; for some said, He is a good man: others said, Nay; but he deceiveth the people" (vii. 12). "Many of the people believed on him" (vii. 31). "The officers answered, Never man spake like this man" (vii. 46). "Then said some of those Jews which believed on him," &c. (viii. 31). "There was a division again amongst the Jews for these sayings" (x. 19). "And many resorted unto him, and said, John did no miracle: but all things that John spake of this man were true." "And many believed on him there" (x. 41, 42).

With respect to the general character of St John's gospel, which, by many others as well as by Mr Gladstone, has been regarded as exhibiting an advanced and peculiar form of the teaching of Christ, we venture to think that something might be urged in favour of a different view of it. We agree with the general statement at least of what is thus expressed by Olshausen:—"More than one gospel was included in the collection of the sacred writings, since only the presentation of different portraitures together could prevent a partial view of our Saviour's character; and we

cannot comprehend the life of our Lord, which affords so many different aspects, without uniting the peculiar traits into one general portraiture" (*Commentary on Gospels*, Introd. p. xlv). It is important to bear in mind that the gospel of the beloved disciple, like other gospels, presents us with a mere abstract and sample of what Jesus did and said (John xx. 30, xxi. 25), and we are justified in assuming that much beyond what is recorded was delivered of a corresponding character. The synoptics give us the general events of our Lord's life, with his teaching in the form of parables, and, with the exception of the sermon on the mount, but a very slight account of his direct teaching. The gospel of St John supplies this, and it may not seem inappropriate to view it as being distinctively the gospel of the discourses of Jesus. Accepting it in this light, instead of putting before us the exceptional teaching of Christ, it might appear as offering to us the truest example of his general style. At any rate, we find in it by far the fullest record of our Lord's continued and direct addresses, and more, we imagine, might be said in support of this view than can with reason be advanced for the opinion maintained by Mr Gladstone, that the gospel represents altogether the extraordinary and exceptional aspect of Christ, and that it is only in the synoptical gospels that he is to be seen as he ordinarily exhibited himself.

But having endeavoured thus to extricate his theory from the difficulty which St John's gospel seemed to involve it in, he states what he conceives to have been our Lord's ordinary exhibition of himself to the world, according to the picture given of him by the other evangelists, which is briefly "that of a man engaged in the holiest ministries, teaching the holiest lessons, and claiming unequivocally, and without appeal, a divine authority for what he said and did ; but beyond this asserting respecting himself nothing." —(P. 104.)

Limiting our view carefully, as Mr Gladstone would require us to limit it, and excluding our Lord's later and more express manifestations of himself, with what might be gathered from the parables, and the early announcements respecting the person of Christ, he yet is set before us as declaring himself "greater than Jonas and Solomon," "greater than the temple," "the Lord of the Sabbath;" as "about to shew judgment unto the Gentiles, who were to trust in him;" as "forgiving sins," not disclaiming the suggested inference, "who can forgive sins but God only?" as appealed to at the day of judgment by many: "Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name, in thy name

cast out devils," &c. ; as " the Son of Man about to come in the glory of his Father with the holy angels, and then to be ashamed of all who had been ashamed of him and his words ;" as stating, finally, that " all things were delivered unto him of the Father ; and no man knoweth the Son but the Father ; neither knoweth any man the Father save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him."

If we look on this picture, and on that, they will, we presume, be allowed to differ. The latter certainly presents to us something more than a man doing good, and divinely commissioned to teach. We deny not, as has been said, a progress in the teaching of our Lord respecting his own nature and work, together with a cautious reserve as circumstances required, both on his own part, and enjoined upon others. We contend only that Mr Gladstone has made too much of this, and carried his theory too far.

But supposing Mr Gladstone to have made good his point, how is it to be applied ? He maintains that as, according to his own view, our Lord exhibited himself partially and imperfectly, so it may be justifiable to exhibit him now. We know, however, that there existed reasons, already observed, which rendered a development of the scheme of Christianity not only advisable but necessary. It could not be set forth as a fact until it became one, and it had not assumed this form before the Passion and Resurrection of our Lord ; and in order to its becoming thus accomplished in the way in which divine wisdom designed that it should be, and without violence being done in any respect to the free agency of man, the state of Jewish feeling and anticipation rendered it equally essential that its truths should be imparted cautiously and progressively. It was expressly put by our Lord himself in the light of a development in progress towards completion, and a fuller disclosure of its nature to the minds of the apostles was clearly promised. (John xiv. 17, 26, xv. 26, xvi. 7-14.) The question then involved is, now that the scheme has been perfected, and the promised additional light imparted, are we at liberty in communicating it to others, to revert to its partial and imperfect announcement, its incipient and yet unaccomplished form ? The state of things which in the beginning explained and justified this, cannot from the mere nature of the case exist again ; and the peculiar attachments and hopes of the people of Israel at the time, are not likely again to find their parallel in the disposition of men's minds.

Mr Gladstone conceives that the feeling, prevailing to some extent in the present day with regard to Christianity,

which rejects the influence of authority and established reception, and is inclined to disbelieve whatever it may have been customary so far to believe, renders this mode of attempting to gain acceptance for truth suitable. It cannot be so for the same reasons which justified it when its first idea was unfolded to the world ; for the state of mind now supposed, and that which then existed, are entirely different. Men are not attached now to an old and deeply rooted system of formal observances, which the reception of the gospel overthrows ; neither are they, like the Jews, indulging hopes respecting its nature, to be disappointed by its real manifestation. The state of belief, or unbelief, which may now more or less exist, does not, as we think, in any degree point to the fragmentary treatment of religious truth as likely to gain it favour. Indeed such a way of representing Christianity now is impracticable. Its general character is known, and men are not by a half statement of it to be thus drawn unawares, as it were, into its full acceptance. Where such representations obtain credence, it will generally be at a serious sacrifice, and by nothing short of the perversion or mutilation of the truth, and a part being taken for the whole. A system thus perverting the Gospel, excluding what might not respond to the natural taste, would probably have its disciples, as such systems indeed have. But it would not be the Gospel, though assuming to be such, which would be thus admitted. A partial, fragmentary exhibition of Christianity, that is, a viewing one or more of its main truths in isolation from the rest, by one holding it in its entirety, seems hardly conceivable, as being honestly made ; for its various parts have their virtue and efficacy by their mutual relation and union. We can recognise, with respect to such a condition of mind as Mr Gladstone supposes, the suitability of an attempt to shew that Christianity rests upon a foundation of reason, and that its great doctrines are not the mere creations of theology ; but we cannot see how an inadequate, and therefore fallacious, sketch of it is adapted to attain the end in view. Nor does such a way of making it known receive any countenance from the practice of its first promulgators, who “shunned not to declare the whole counsel of God,”—not that they always entered equally into its depths or its details, but they represented it, though, in their general preaching of it, very simply, yet in its completeness. The Epistles are much more profound than the sermons recorded in the Acts, but as regards its main outlines, they deliver one message. The question in dispute is not of a progress from the more rudimentary to the more advanced, but of a discription of

the Gospel message, and an attempted exhibition of one of its fragments separately. Those who first made the good news known to the world, afford no precedent for such a method of imparting it.

But we pass from the general application of Mr Gladstone's theory to the special instance of it to which his book refers, and we conceive that 'Ecce Homo' but exemplifies and confirms the view which has been stated. It is an attempt at a fragmentary representation of Christianity, and its author, in seeking to comprehend and expound the portion to which he limits himself, viewing it without recognising its connection with the system of which it forms but a part, and endeavouring to deal with the part as though it were a whole, has placed it in a false and delusive light, and has been led to assign causes, absurdly inadequate to the end to be attained. We are reminded of Bishop Butler's illustration, otherwise by him applied, of one seeing through a small aperture the partial working of a complicated piece of mechanism, and being thus led to form mistaken views, and to reason erroneously respecting it. "Ecce Homo" is a deceptive glimpse at its subject, similiar to this. We cannot now examine it at any length, and it has already received a special consideration in this *Review* (see No. LVII); but we may endeavour, so far as our present argument may require, briefly to state its general scope. This it will not be difficult to do, as it is a book, as we understand it, of one main pervading principle, and most of what else it may seem to contain will be found to rest upon this, or to flow from it.

The object which Christ had in view is stated to be, that "God's will might be done on earth, as it is done in heaven: in the language of our own day, the improvement of morality" (p. 89). This was to be effected permanently and immediately by the agency of the society, which he came to found, the Christian Church. But, in the first instance, how was the revolution in the morals of men to be brought about? What was to originate the first impulse which was to be propagated and transmitted by the Christian society? The answer to this inquiry places before us the whole drift of the book.

As resolving the problem, "Why was Christ so successful? Why did men gather round him at his call?" we read, "It was the combination of greatness with self-sacrifice which won their hearts; the mighty power held under a mighty control; the unspeakable condescension, the *cross of Christ*" (p. 48). We have here nothing more than the personal influence of example. Again, responding to the question, "What is Christ's machinery for making the bad good?"

the author of "Ecce Homo" writes: "He (Christ) says the first step towards good dispositions is for a man to form a strong personal attachment. Let him first be drawn out of himself. Next, let the object of that attachment be a person of striking and conspicuous goodness. To worship such a person will be the best exercise in virtue he can have. . . . This is Christ's scheme stated in its most naked form. We shall have abundant opportunities in the sequel of expounding it more fully" (p. 98). The sequel here referred to is the second part of the volume, occupying more than two-thirds of it, on the Legislation of Christ, and it is no more than an expansion of what is here stated, in accordance with what is said at the outset of it, "Christ himself is the Christian's law" (p. 110).

Quotations to the same purport as the above might be multiplied to any extent, and they would all amount simply to this, that Christ came to regenerate the world by the power of an overwhelming example of goodness. The first impression would be upon the men of his own age. From them the influence was to spread, and descend from generation to generation throughout the world's history. In him they beheld human nature realised in its true and perfect ideal. Such purity, such love, such self-sacrificing devotion to the good of others, was exhibited in him, that he became an object of ardent love to them. In their hearts they vowed devotion to him. He was to be the model henceforth to them of their thoughts and acts; and witnessing his love for man, they became animated by a similar passion,—they loved all men in him, and for his sake. Even those who individually possessed qualities calculated to excite feelings opposite to that of love, were loved, as sharing the same nature in common with Christ. Owing to this feeling dwelling in him, and ever actuating him, the Christian became a law unto himself. He was not to be trammelled by the exactions of any external code. He became independent of such; the elevation of moral character, caught by contact with Christ, became his unerring guide, repressing, or rather preventing altogether, the evil thought or wish, and instinctively suggesting in every emergency the right course of action. Such was the agency by which men from being evil were to be made good; the presence amongst them during a period of three years, and within the confines of a limited tract of country, of a being of supereminent goodness.

As, however, mention is made in "Ecce Homo" of the Holy Spirit, and the words sometimes commence with capitals, it might, on a cursory view, be inferred that the agency of the Holy Spirit, in the sense in which it is ordin-

arily understood, is admitted in the work of man's regeneration; and were it so, it would considerably modify the light in which we might regard the book. But it is clear that the author of "Ecce Homo" uses the term "Holy Spirit" in a sense of his own. As it is important to a correct understanding of "Ecce Homo" that this point should be made evident, we will quote a few passages in which the expression occurs.

"This moral sensitiveness, this absolute harmony of inward desire with outward obligation, was called by Christ and his apostles by a name of which holiness is the recognised English equivalent, and it is attributed to the presence of a Divine Spirit within the soul. . . . This enthusiasm is emphatically the presence of the Holy Spirit. It is called here the Enthusiasm of Humanity."—P. 320.

Should this appear ambiguous, other extracts will make it plain how we are to receive it. We read again,—

"But, say the cautions, is it safe to follow a mere enthusiasm? If Christ is to be believed, it is not safe to follow anything else. According to him this Spirit was expressly given to guide men into all truth."—P. 203.

The allusion here is obviously to our Lord's familiar words in St John, and it is scarcely necessary to point out that the "Spirit" is made identical with an "enthusiasm."

Again, to the same purport,—

"It was fully understood in the early church that this enthusiastic or elevated condition of mind was the distinctive and essential mark of a Christian. St Paul having asked some converts whether they had received this divine inspiration since their conversion, and receiving for answer that they had not heard there was any such divine inspiration abroad, demanded in amazement what then they had been baptised unto."—P. 147.

The allusion is to Acts xix. 2, where "divine inspiration" is the "Holy Ghost."

Lastly, we read,—

"Further, Christ was to baptise with a holy spirit and with fire. John felt his own baptism to have something cold and negative about it. . . . It was necessary that an enthusiasm should be kindled. . . . Baptism means cleansing, and fire means warmth. How can warmth cleanse? The answer is that *moral* warmth does cleanse."—P. 7.

It seems impossible to resist the conclusion which these quotations suggest, that in the language of the author of "Ecce Homo," "divine inspiration," "Holy Spirit," "an enthusiastic and elevated condition of mind," called elsewhere the "enthusiasm of humanity," and "moral warmth," mean one and the same thing. Thus, then, in his view, the Holy Spirit is not the producing agent, but the state of mind

produced in the Christian by contact with the example of Christ. This view derives confirmation, if such be needed, from the sense in which prophetic inspiration is accepted by him, according to which it is simply resolved, as it often is by writers of his class, into the same feeling that animates the poet and the artist.

“Prophecy,” he says, “was one of those gifts which, like poetry or high art, are particularly apt to die out under a change of times. Several centuries had succeeded each other which were all alike incapable of producing it.”—P. 2.

Similarly again,—

“The divine inspiration which made a man capable of ruling had been considered to resemble that which made a man a prophet, or makes in these days a poet or inspired artist.”—P. 28.

This view of the writer of “*Ecce Homo*,” with respect to the Holy Spirit, bears upon another question, namely, In what light he may probably be supposed to regard the person of our Lord. He makes no assertion on this point, and therefore may be allowed to have the benefit of such uncertainty as may consequently exist. But while we admit that there are some striking passages in the book, in which a most lofty character is ascribed to Christ, yet he who resolves the Holy Spirit, the third Person in the Trinity, into a mere subjective condition of the mind of man, can hardly appear likely to be sound in his belief as to the second Person. Some of the strongest proofs for the divinity of the Son, equally support that of the Holy Spirit, and if they avail not in the latter case, they lose their force and significance in the former. It has been well said, that “the humanity of Christ affords a sort of veil or pretext, under which men may say much that is true of him, without admitting his proper deity. The Holy Ghost has no humanity, he is the *Spirit of God*, and they have no pretext for vague commendation of him under human aspects and conditions. If they deny his divine personality, that of the Son falls with it.”

Since, then, the agency of the Holy Spirit, in the ordinary sense of the words, is not admitted by the writer of “*Ecce Homo*,” our assertion remains undisturbed, that the drift of the book is to shew that the influence by which man was to be elevated was the example of Christ. The enthusiasm of humanity, which was to be the moral lever, was to be communicated by personal attachment to Christ in the beginning, and afterwards to be sustained by the agency of the church.

We cannot now discuss this principle, though it might readily be shewn, how experience and all likelihood are against it, and how it is entirely contradicted by the varying picture which is set before us of the first followers of our Lord, in the Gospels, and the Acts ; the former representing them, when living in constant intercourse with their Master, and under the immediate power of that example, which was to effect so much, as weak, timid, and inconstant ; while the latter describes them as men animated by a new impulse, as fearless of danger or death, and as cheerfully wearing out their lives in the service of him who was no longer with them,—being, as we believe, under an influence stronger than that of any example ; an influence unrestricted, either as regards time or place, and which may be as potent now as it was then. But we attempt not to do more than thus state the principles which it is the labour of “*Ecce Homo*” to establish, and to observe respecting it, that in thus presenting a partial view, it sets forth a gross perversion of the Gospel scheme. Its writer, in the conclusion of the preface to the fifth edition, deprecates condemnation on this ground. But we contend that it is an unfair, and, indeed, an impracticable mode of dealing with Christianity, and that a part of it can no more be justly viewed by itself, than the nature and functions of a branch or a limb could be investigated without respect being had to the tree or the body to which they might belong. The example of the Holy and the Just One is indeed most precious in its place, and when taken in conjunction with the system of truth, of which it is a portion ; but, regarded alone, it is deprived of its efficacy. The same may be said as respects any other detached fragment of the great doctrines which centre in Christ ; and our objection against “*Ecce Homo*” is, not that this or that Christian doctrine has no account taken of it, but that the combination of sublime verities, forming God’s message of mercy to man, is explained away, as in the case of the Holy Spirit, is unrecognised, or is virtually denied, in the endeavour to shew that it may be done without, or that its end may be accomplished by a different agency.

Such is the volume for which Mr Gladstone offers himself as the apologist. We consider that the plea which he puts forward in its behalf is altogether inapplicable. We do not admit his theory in the extreme form in which he advances it, and we have shewn, that in his eagerness to establish it, he has not been very careful with regard to the facts which are alleged. But had he ever so satisfactorily proved his point, namely, that our Lord ordinarily exhibited himself during his ministry as no more than a divinely commis-

sioned teacher, this would not justify any such imperfect exhibition of him now ; as the peculiar circumstances, which then would have rendered it necessary, no longer exist, and indeed cannot again. The present prevailing condition of human thought and feeling, certainly in no respect corresponds with it ; nor, to our view, do its requirements seem likely to be met by such a book as “ *Ecce Homo*,” as Mr Gladstone considers that they may. It cannot satisfy the sceptical, who seek proof for what is to be believed ; as nothing of the kind is offered. It may possibly be of service to some who believe, by bringing prominently forward truths and duties which may have been insufficiently regarded. But we fear it may have done a far greater amount of mischief, by unsettling the belief of many, or leading them to embrace a view of Christianity which is false. While speaking thus unfavourably of it, we are by no means insensible to its literary merits, and to much in it which, viewed by itself, is excellent. But, taken as a whole, we are constrained to look upon it as a pernicious work, and likely to prove all the more so, owing to the charm of its style, and the plausible aspect which it wears. Gladly would we hope that the fragment, or fragments, yet to be added to it, might place it in a less objectionable light. But the slight shadowing forth of what is to come, towards the close of the volume, does not incline us to suppose that it will be an improvement on what has already appeared.

We regret that it should have found such an eulogist as Mr Gladstone, whose opinion possibly will influence many ; though we cannot think it will weigh much with those who take a correct estimate of its value. It may be regarded as no more than one of those fancies, which his clever, but not very judicious, mind is apt to seize, and to advocate, as he does almost everything, to adopt words already used respecting him, “ with the zeal of recent conversion ;” for nearly every view which he now supports, is in entire opposition to those he formerly as earnestly maintained. We only trust that he may remain faithful to that creed which we would willingly believe him, as regards its essentials at least, still to hold ; and that he may not advance yet further on the road, on which, it would appear, he has already set out, judging from the volume we have been considering,—respecting which we would but suggest, that all who may read it, would, before they adopt its views, test for themselves the accuracy of its statements. In thus referring to Mr Gladstone, we are free from bias of any kind ; we speak dispassionately, and purely in the interests of truth.

ART. VIII.—*German Romanism.*

1. *Johann Adam Möhler, Ein Lebensbild.* Von Professor BALTHASAR WÖRNER, Regensburg, Manz. 1866.
2. *Kirchengeschichte.* VON JOHANN A. MÖHLER. Herausgegeben von P. B. GAMS. Regensburg, Manz. 1867-8.

GERMAN ROMANISM receded in the sixteenth century, advanced again in the early part of the seventeenth. Not a little of the ground in Southern Germany lost at the Reformation was regained by Jesuit effort and Austrian persistency of aim, aided by the unfortunate confessional estrangement of Lutherans and Calvinists. The Treaty of Westphalia fixed down the territorial differences of Romanism and Protestantism much as they are now, 220 years after that Peace. The royal family of Saxony have since abandoned the Protestant faith, without thereby un-Protestantising their subjects. But while German Romanism has made little external progress for the last two centuries, it has experienced a number of internal shocks. Jansenism, more in its ecclesiastical than in its doctrinal form, more as an advocate of episcopal and metropolitan powers than of a rigid Augustinianism of faith, issued its manifesto in the middle of the last century, in the "Book on the State of the Church," by Febronius, whose real name was Nicolas v. Hontheim, coadjutor-bishop of Treves. The anti-Curialist principles of Febronius were, in the main, patronised by the Empress Maria Theresa and Joseph II., and in the Austrian dominions, German and Italian, with the outlying dependency of Tuscany, the influence of the Hapsburgs was thrown into the scale against the modern assertions of Rome. A succession of influential writers on Church law,—as Ries at Mentz, the two Rieggers, father and son, v. Eybel, and Rautenstrauch at Vienna,—contributed greatly to influence the minds of statesmen in their views. A number of the clergy also shared them; and the Congress of Ems, in 1788, at which were present the four archbishops of Treves, Cologne, Mentz, and Salzburg, drew up a "Punctuation," in which Febronian views were embodied. Principles, which left to Rome a pre-eminence purely of the Church's assigning, and made him no "Vicar of Christ," with little more than "Patriarchate" dignity, were, of course, most distasteful to the Romish Curia; and jealousy was skilfully fostered among the German bishops, as if the nearer metropolitan sway would practically be far more hard than the distant Papal one. But the influence of the French Revolution was, practically, far more powerful in arresting the progress of Febronianism than any other cause. Jansenism, so weak as to clutch at any ally, had, in France,

called in the aid of Liberalism, Liberalism had ended in Revolution, and Revolution had separated Church and State, with not a little of murder of clergy, and of "religious" of either sex, to give additional zest to the confiscation !

Nor can it be denied that the temper of Febronian canonists and clergy was, in the main, not one of zealously earnest men. In them could be hailed no successors of A'Kempis or Tauler. The school was one of morality, not of devotion ; and the weakness of Latitudinarianism is felt in the second generation, if it seems to escape notice in the first. The same charge could not be brought against the influence of Sailer, who died bishop of Ratisbon. He and his school were men earnestly bent on the promotion of practical religion, favourable to intercourse with Protestants, and lamenting the confessional differences between devout Christians. Much practical good has doubtless been effected by the writing and the example of such men as Sailer, Feneberg, and Diepenbröck. But none of them shook themselves off from the confusion of justification and sanctification in the formularies and teaching of the Romish Church, and this necessarily greatly limited their influence for good.

A third direction taken by Romanist thought in Germany, was that of such men as Boos, Henhöfer, Lindl, Gossner, and Poschl. These men might be properly classed with Luther, after he had attained to evangelical views of the way of acceptance with God, and before he saw it needful to break with Rome. Some of these men were constrained to leave the Romish communion : none of them would have willingly relinquished it. They laid the chief stress on the preaching of Christ crucified, and therein were at one with the best contemporary German Protestants. But if this could have been, with all its practical consequences, conceded to them in the Church of Rome, they would have remained her zealous, though not her bigoted or exclusive, adherents. A Protestant, holding justification by faith, was nearer and dearer to them than a Catholic looking for salvation to works. All of them had much of the reproach and even persecution of the cross to undergo.

Still another tendency of German Romanism was represented in such men as Jahn of Vienna, and others like-minded, in whom the influence of Protestant Rationalism took root, more or less thoroughly. But it was far from spreading as wide, or lasting as long, in the Romanist, as in the Protestant Church of Germany.

Different from all these directions of theological thought, and destined to oppose in turn all of them, was the character and the principles of John Adam Möhler. His fame has been

not re-habilitated (it had never died away), but more vividly brought before the contemporary public by the recent publication of the two works whose titles form the heading of this article.

Both of the works are issued by the same writer, Gams, although a large part of the materials of the first were collected and prepared for publication by Möhler's fellow-student and warm friend, Professor Wörner. We are not informed why no public use was made of them in the latter's life-time. On his death in 1861, his literary executors placed them for publication in the present editor's hands. He owns his obligations, in the compiling of the volume, to the assistance of the written communications of Professor Hefele of Tübingen, and to the "Necrology" drawn up, the year of Möhler's death, by Professor Reithmayr of Munich, who also contributed the sketches of Möhler's life and works prefixed to the later editions of the "Symbolik," and inserted in the seventh volume of the *Kirchen Lexicon*.

Möhler was born on the 6th May 1796, at Igersheim, a village near Mergentheim, on the Tauber, in the extreme north of the kingdom of Wurtemberg. His father was innkeeper and bailiff there ; and was only induced, by the strong propensity to learning which the boy showed, to give up his idea of bringing him up to his own business. The Latin school at Mergentheim prepared him for the Lyceum at Ellwangen, where he chiefly distinguished himself in the philosophical class. Thence he repaired to the theological academy in the same place, of the teaching and the practices in which Wörner gives a very depreciatory account. The lecture seem to have been superficial, and the discipline next to none. As contemporaries here, Möhler had, among others, Prince Alexander Hohenlohe, afterwards of miracle-mongering notoriety, and Joseph Wolff, then a Romanist. King William I., of Wurtemberg, soon after his accession, broke up the academy at Ellwangen, and transferred the students to the University of Tübingen. Here there was a far larger circle of students, as all the faculties were represented there ; and the Protestant youths freely interchanged communications with the Romanist ones.

Möhler, in the end of the year 1818, exchanged the Tübingen University for the clerical seminary at Rotterburg. His biographer represents him as deriving little benefit from the meagre prelections at either place of instruction. "The spiritual, the priestly element of life, was not recognised ; religious depth and inwardness, true delight in faith and noble aspirations, found no room for themselves there."

The experience of these three seminaries influenced Möhler in after life not a little : it led him to associate all reforms in the

Romish Church with a Rationalist tendency. Too much of what he had seen of Protestantism also looked in the same direction.

He obtained both deacon's and priest's orders in the year 1819, but never had a parish of his own. He officiated as (to use Anglican phraseology) a curate at Weilderstadt and Redlingen for about a twelvemonth. His vicar in the latter place, Canon Thöbele, gives him a very high character for earnestness, kindness, and assiduity, praises his preaching powers, and extols his gifts and acceptance among the young people, whom he had to catechise.

But his powers were manifestly suited rather to an academical than to a pastoral function; and from 1820 to 1822 he was employed as a teacher in the Gymnasium at Tübingen. He was then, on the removal of Dresch to Landshut, nominated "privat docent" of church history, with a salary of 800 florins. Means were also found for his travelling for six months, and seeing the course of tuition in other German Universities. This course of travel embraced Wurtzburg, Romberg, Jena, Leipzig, Halle, Berlin, Breslau, Prague, Vienna, and Munich. Coming in contact with the chief Protestant as well as Romanist, professors of Germany he had full opportunity to compare opinions and to consider views.

It will be seen that Möhler was indebted for his specific views, not to his teachers, by any means, so much as to his private studies. His biographer laments that a number of the text-books then used in Romanist seminaries were those of Protestant Rationalists, such as Kuinoel and Koppe. The Romanist authorities were chiefly "Josephine." In any circumstance, Möhler was a man of too great force, both of genius and of character, and of too great determination to study "aus den quellen," to have been the mere follower of any professors, however eminent. He would anyhow have carved a way for himself. But in the actual circumstances of the case, there was the more opportunity for the development of Möhler's peculiar powers. He was a thoroughly individual thinker; he was a thoroughly conscientious and painstaking student. In him thought did not dispense with learning; in him learning did not overpower thought. He had, especially during the latter part of his residence at Tübingen, devoted himself to the study of classical, and especially of Greek, literature and philosophy, and would have endeavoured to obtain a chair of the latter character, had not the professorial vacancy at Tübingen occurred.

Möhler began his lectures in the winter quarter of 1823-4. His course embraced church history, church law, and patrology,

—the last an introduction to the study of the fathers of the first three centuries, and an explanation of the *Stromata* of Clement of Alexandria. These lectures, especially those on church history, attracted from the first great attention, and were attended by Protestant as well as Romanist students. His “Introduction to the Study of Church History,” published in his *Remains*, vol. ii., gives a fair idea of his profound acquaintance with, as well as deep interest in, this branch of theological study. The explanation of the “*Stromata*” was succeeded by that of the “*Treatise on the Priesthood*,” by Chrysostom.

At the same time, he was actively engaged as a *colloborateur* in the lately established “*Tübingen Quartal Schrift*,” to which he ever afterwards continued a valued contributor. “Church history and Patristic studies were most to his taste,” says his biographer; but his contributions to this Review, of which a full list and not a few specimens are given in this volume, embrace almost every branch of theological science. His reviews are always informing, well studied, and giving a fair account of the books they notice; sometimes they form most valuable contributions to our knowledge on the points they embrace.

In 1825 appeared his first distinctive work, on the “Unity of the Church,” which was well received, and gave much promise of his future fame, but was afterwards regarded and spoken of by him as a book bearing too many marks of juvenile hurry and inexactitude. “It was,” he writes, “the work of a buoyant youth, that dealt honestly with God, the Church, and the World; but in much which is found in it I can no longer concur: all is not carefully thought out and logically developed,” (*Life*, p. 26). To this period belong the two important papers in his *Remains* on the Epistle to Diognetus, and the difference between Augustine and Jerome about the meaning of Gal. ii. 11–14.

The same year, he made his first appearance in exegetical prelections, by explaining to his class the Epistle to the Romans. He continued his patristical labours by lecturing on Chrysostom, Augustine, and Theodoret. Becoming an Extraordinary Professor of Theology in 1826, he read lectures on the works of Athanasius “On the Incarnation,” and the “Orations against the Arians.” The further fruit of his study of the great eastern defender of orthodoxy appeared in the next year, in his book, in two volumes, afterwards published in one, “Athanasius the Great, and the Church of his Time.” The six books, of which this work consists, contain a most clear, ample, and satisfactory account of that father and his age; and among the multitude of patristic monographs that have within this century emanated from the German Press, Romanist or Protestant, merits a fore-

most place. A most important paper on Charlemagne and his bishops, written about this time, is given entire in the latter part of this volume. It is followed by a very suggestive paper on Christian Philosophy in ancient and modern times.

In 1828, Möhler declined an invitation from the Prussian Government to a chair at Breslau, and was appointed Ordinary Professor of Theology at Tübingen. The same year he received his diploma of Doctor of Theology from his own University, "on account of his writings, the evidences of his extensive learning and his teaching, the manifestation of extraordinary gifts, and meeting with universal acceptance."

The various works on his favourite theme of church history, which, from one year to another, proceeded from the pens of Katerkamp, Locherer, Hortig, Ritter, Reichlin-Meldegg, Ruttenstock, and Strahl, were subjected by him to careful and candid review, and in those contributions to the "*Quartal Schrift*" he often threw out views on difficult or contested subjects, which proved with how keen an eye he had thought out for himself on the many problems which that branch of theological science embraces. The volumes of Neander (who he greatly admired as a church history professor) on Tertullian, and of Ullmann on Gregory Nazianzen, found in him an appreciating and honourable critic.

His pen was never idle, never feeble, never frivolous, never vain, never selfish. He was severe only to incompetence or to unfounded self assertion. Even the minor critical notices of Möhler are full of information to the youthful student, of mental exercitation and stimulus to the further advanced reader. There is always the exercise of a sound and fine taste, which has respect to the manner of writing, the proportion which the different parts of a treatise ought to have to one another. There is nothing ever hurried, nothing superficial, nothing needlessly repetitive, nothing showing one part of the subject cultivated at the expense of another. In his reviews, Möhler shews himself perhaps as great as in any of his writings, for he prepared the short, the passing, the anonymous, as carefully as if they had formed parts of the most elaborate volume. Those of the criticisms preserved in the volume before us, make us regret that a larger number have not been collected in an accessible form. They show a divine who had paid attention, as few have done, to the phases which theological opinion, which ecclesiastical thought, have assumed in all ages from the first to our own time. The organic whole of Christianity, in all its eras, is a subject which has been more studied in Germany than anywhere else; and to this theme the works of Möhler shew that he had paid special attention.

Möhler's first decidedly polemical public appearance was a

paper contributed to the "*Katholik*" in 1828, combating the efforts then made, especially in Southern Germany, to get rid of clerical celibacy. In this article he draws a picture of the priest, sequestered and severed from earthly cares, from disturbing domestic concerns, and wholly intent on the care of his flock,—a picture such as the necessities of Romanist controversy make needful,—a picture such as, doubtless, he drew in perfect honesty of soul,—but a picture such as neither Scripture nor general experience present as practically realised. The ideal priest of controversy, and the actual priest of everyday life, are two very different beings.

In the two next years, his most important papers were on the Pseudo-Isidore, and the relation of Mohammedanism to Christianity. A most thoughtful and informing paper, in which the literary and philosophical emerge more than in his articles in general, is that on the Condition of the Church in the fifteenth and commencement of the sixteenth centuries. He now enlarged his subjects of tuition by prelecting on general symbolics, a subject which involved much study of the confessions and chief writings of the different divisions of Christendom. The fruit of several years' careful consideration of this wide theme appeared in that one of his books, which has been most read, in the original or in translations, the "*Symbolik*," contrasting Romanist doctrine with the dogmatics of the chief Protestant churches. It appeared in 1832, made a great sensation, and called forth a number of replies, both from rationalist and evangelical Protestants in the Fatherland. It was followed in 1834 by a supplementary work of "*New Researches on the points in controversy between Catholics and Protestants.*" This was more expressly directed against the criticisms of his protestant colleague at Tübingen, Professor Baur. In the same year appeared his article on the extinction of slavery in Europe, a subject on which he has cast much light.

Möhler's next literary project was a *History of Monachism*. This, the reader is probably aware, was also, as appears from his letters, a favourite idea of Southey's, whose magnificent library was rich in monastic lore, gathered for the purpose during many years. But what literary task-work hindered in the English man of letters, failing health prevented in the German divine. Möhler was not to be teacher or rival here to Montalembert. An interesting fragment, however, of the projected great work was published by Dollinger, in the second volume of the "*Remains.*" The portrait of Möhler, prefixed to his posthumous "*Patrologie*," and to his *Life*, shew a delicate, weak-chested man, and he seems never to have enjoyed robust health. This, as well as limited means, may have been the reason for his having travelled so little. He

was never out of Germany. His fine taste would have revelled in the sight of French minsters and Italian basilicas, but neither was he ever permitted to see.

In the spring of 1835, Möhler was invited, by that great patron of learning and art, Louis I. of Bavaria, to a chair at Munich. He had previously been sought in vain by the Prussian king for Bonn and Munster. In Munich he prelected on patrology, church history, and Scripture exegesis. After a year and a half of labour in the Bavarian capital, he was obliged, by a severe attack of illness, to retire to Meran, where the use of the waters was instrumental in restoring him to a measure of health.

He resumed his prelections on the epistle to the Romans, and went on to other of the Pauline epistles, busying himself also with preparing the former for the press. But in the winter of 1837-8, a variety of complaints attacked him; his old chest symptoms returned, aggravated with fever. The Munich climate had never suited him. Further south than Tübingen, it is yet less warm. The imprisonment of v. Dröste Vischering, Archbishop of Cologne, by the Prussian Government, for his refusal to sanction mixed marriages, unless all the children were to be brought up Romanists, preyed much on Möhler's mind, in his weak state of health. Yet he conceived it duty to come forward on the archbishop's side, which he did, first in the "*Allgemeine Zeitung*," and then his last publication in the Munich "*Politische Zeitung*." The latter is republished in his *Remains*. As he wrote with temper and moderation, in a strain very different from the "*Athanasius*" of Göne, who sought to make his pamphlet as irritating as possible to Prussian susceptibilities, Frederick William III. made yet another attempt, through a visit to Möhler of Councillor Brüggemann, to obtain his services for the Rhenish Provinces. Either a canonry at Cologne, or a professorship at Bonn, were at his option. But he declined them both, and, at his request, the matter remained, during the brief remainder of his life, a secret.

King Louis, in the beginning of 1838, conferred on him the Cross of the Order of St Michael, and in the end of March, the vacant deanery of Würzburg was, by the same royal favour, conferred on him. The milder climate of his new appointment would, it was hoped, restore his shaken health. In a letter to a friend, dated the 25th March, he expresses his warmest thanks to his sovereign for his thoughtful kindness, but mingles with this his grief at relinquishing the professorial functions so long and so pleasingly engaged in. A sudden change of weather for the worse dashed all hopes of recovery to the ground. Cough, hoarseness, nervous fever, and occasional

delirium set in. He was never able to be even installed in his new dignity. The rest of the new honour came too late. As in Munich, he had begun to decay, so there he died. He carefully arranged all his temporal concerns, received the sacraments of his church on the 10th April, and expired about 1 P.M. on the 12th of the same month. He awoke then out of a soft slumber, moved both hands above his head, and said, "Ah, now I have seen it, now I know it; now I would write a book; it would be indeed a book, but now it is past!" Three heavy breathings then, and all was over. His very largely attended funeral on the 14th, attested the veneration in which he was held.

Möhler was tall but slimly made, of dark complexion, and grave manners. Retiring in character, though not unsocial, he used to compare his house to a Benedictine cell. But his correspondance with his friends still attests, as their verbal testimony after his death also did, how essentially kindly he was in disposition. Somewhat naturally quick in temper, he had learned to subdue all manifestations of that quickness, and to cultivate moderation, both in speaking and in writing. He was a great favourite with his students, both at Tübingen and at Munich, both as a lecturer and as an examiner. He took a deep interest in the literary projects of those who had been his students, and indeed of all whom he believed capable of using the press to purpose.

A cherished early project of his was the history of the introduction of Christianity into Southern Germany, which, however remained merely in plan; but his successor at Tübingen, Dr Hafele, to whom apparently the same design had independently occurred, published a valuable work on the subject. His colleague at Munich, Dr Döllinger, published in 1839-40 two volumes of literary remains, including some of the best of his contributions to the "Tübingen Quartal Schrift," and other Romanist journals.

As Möhler's reputation stood high among his co-religionists as an exegete, yet anxiety was after his death shewn for the appearance of some specimen of his powers in that department of theology. The Epistle to the Romans had first, and to the last, occupied his mind. It was his favourite epistle. His prelections on it had rivetted the attention and delighted the understanding of all his students both at Tübingen and Munich. Their wish to have a permanent record of what had so impressed their youthful minds, was shared by his colleagues and Catholic Germany in general. Nor were the Protestants of the Fatherland undesirous to know what Möhler would bring out of an epistle, which, since the time of Luther and Calvin, might be said to be so peculiarly claimed by the

Reformed as their own. All these expectations were doomed to disappointment. Möhler's colleague at Munich, Dr Reithmayr, undertook the preparation of the manuscript for the press, but found, on examination, that many parts were mere hints, which, in prelecting, had been verbally expanded, and many other parts were, though fully written out, untenable in respect of interpreting the apostle's meaning. From the general way in which the latter objection is stated, we are left in doubt whether Möhler had approached, more nearly than was deemed prudent to confess, to the usual strain of evangelically Protestant explanation of this great epistle.

The same literary friend charged himself with the editing the "Patrology" of Möhler. This also had been an early and always laboured at composition of Möhler's. The material for his first volume—on the "Unity of the Church"—had been gathered from a careful study of the Fathers of the first three centuries, and, as he was never satisfied with his compositions, MSS. or published (which the alterations on each edition of the "Symbolik" shewed), the thirteen years of life he had afterwards were constantly producing improvements. This work was therefore also eagerly expected by a large circle of admirers. It appeared in 1840, embracing the Fathers of the first three centuries, in a goodly octavo of nearly a thousand pages. No other work we know is so handy and useful to students. No fewer than seventy-four authors are enumerated. First the life is given; then a general description of their writing, distinguishing, in different sections, the authentic from the supposititious; and next a development of the doctrine of each. The patristic student will find it an excellent introduction to the knowledge of the Anti-Nicene Church. The object is more general, less polemical, and the treatment less one-sided than in the works of Bishop Bull, who too frequently seems straining to make out a case.

In the introduction, general and special, Möhler goes over the advantage of patristic study, the objections to it, the different eras of the Fathers, the qualifications generally ascribed to the Fathers,—learning, holiness, church recognition, and antiquity,—the differences of value in the different grades of authors, and in diverse works of the same authors. Authors not fully recognised, as Clement of Alexandria, Origen, and Emaline of Cesarea, are more properly styled "ecclesiastical writers" than Fathers. The name "Father" is derived from the word "pater" or "papa," formerly given to all clergymen, though now in the Romish Church restricted to the head of their hierarchy. Möhler remarks that, properly speaking, as long as the Church lasts there will be writers worthy to be enrolled in the list of Fathers. He divides church history, in

respect of authorship, into three sections,—the Greek-Roman, lasting till the close of the intellectual activity of the Eastern Church in John of Damascus ; the Germanic, from there to the end of the fifteenth century ; the Greek-Roman-Germanic, from that time to the present day. The delineation he gives of the circumstances in which the early Christian authorship originated, and the preparation of the Greek-Roman world for its coming on the scene, is very comprehensive and masterly.

There is, of course, an overvaluing of the early Christian literature in comparison with later developments. The three Protestant centuries are assuredly far ahead, in most respects, of the first three Patristic centuries. Wherever the principle of church authority is admitted, either by Romanists or Anglicans, some bias of intellectual appreciation must be the result. The great Protestant systematists or exegetes, will never, in some circumstances, get justice done them in the comparison or contrast. With this exception, “*The Patrologie*” is a very valuable and useful book. We extract some of his remarks on the relation of the Greek and Latin speech and literature to the Christian Church.

“ As the Christian Church first spread itself in the Roman empire, in which the Grecian cultivation, with its daughter, the Italian, was the ruling one, so the Hellenic and Latin languages were the chief ones employed by that church, though not the only ones, for the services of the Syriac, Ethiopic, Arabian, Armenian, and others were also used. But the two classical tongues were, in the first era, the most important by far, as well as the most widely diffused. There is in this an especial guidance of divine providence to be admired. Two nations, endowed with the most brilliant natural gifts, had for centuries laboured in the cultivation of their languages, and brought them to so high a range of perfection, that the fulness of the Christian mode of thought might express itself in the form most suitable to itself. The Greek tongue particularly, the organ of an intelligent, clear, acutely thinking people, for long the medium of an elevated culture not to be found elsewhere, had united to a rare richness a still rarer exactness, suited itself thereby, in quite a peculiar manner, to the revival of the religion of the Word (Logos). Christianity, on the other hand, prepared for the speech and literature of the Greeks and Romans a fortune which, without its aid, they could scarcely have enjoyed. The history of both, viz., of our religion, and of the intellectual circumstances of the above-named peoples, was now so closely interwoven one with the other, that the old classical literature was, at least in great part, preserved throughout the revolutions of the period, and the merited admiration of it carried onward in consequence. The Christian Church shewed herself not ungrateful for the services rendered to her ; and she, the immortal, elevated far above all possibility of decay, lent of her inseparable attributes to what, in them.

selves, were but the productions of a certain era and a limited field of space. If Christianity had not for centuries before availed herself of the materials of the Greek and Latin languages, and then attached her original history to them, both would, in the course of ages, have perished, with all the treasures of classical literature. The Hebrew language was too poor and national, and as it was never employed for literary and abstract investigations, too metaphorical and inexact, for Christianity to be able to move freely in it, and reach its destination of being the universal religion. The same remark applies to all the Semetic languages; none of them had been employed for purposes of profound and varied intellectual culture. We see in the writings of the Cabbalists, how they have recourse to the most extraordinary imagery, in order, in an imperfect way at least, to express their thoughts. If afterwards the Syrian, and still more the Arabian, language, became at all capable of adaptation to scientific uses, it was through the instrumentality of the Greek, as the tongue from which, especially by the Mohammedan Arabs, translations were made.” —(*Patrologie*, p. 35-6).

In the Life before us there are a number of letters, almost all previously unprinted, of Möhler's, at different periods of his life, from his North Genevan tour, in 1822-3, to his residence at Meran, in 1837. From one of the former period, addressed to his uncle, Vicariatsrath Messner, in Rotterburg, we extract part of his discription of Berlin :—

“ In fact my travels would have lost a great part of their value, if I had not taken your advice and gone to the Prussian capital. One has only to know the names of the theological professors, Schleiermacher, Marheinepe, Neander, Strauss (the author of the *Glöckertöne*), in order to know what one has to expect. Here is sound, inward, deep, truly literary life and labour; literature shews itself in its true essence; it comprehends thought and life. I admired Planck, but what is Planck compared with Neander? Planck floats on the surface; Neander embraces everything, even to the most profound! What study of original authorities, what judgment, what deep religiousness, what earnestness, what clearness and precision in the representation, how living, how attractive is the picture of the times which Neander delineates! In how masterly a manner does he know how to describe the men who were the ruling spirits of their times; with what undeviating justice does he apportion praise or blame to each! He stands far above Planck; Neander's prelections will be ever memorable to me; they will have decided influence on my church-historical labours. His private life is pervaded by enlightened piety; it is simple as the conduct of a village schoolmaster; his character is loveable and unassuming in the highest degree; he knows in Berlin no street but that which leads him to the University; he knows no persons but his professorial colleagues; but Origen, Tertullian, Augustine, Chrysostom, St Bernard, the letters of Boniface, and so on, he knows them profoundly. His demeanour is, on account of its total want of polish, laughable, but no one laughs at him for it; unbounded

is the reverence and love which his students, the respect which his colleagues, the regard which the government, shew towards him. I went frequently to him, both when he had company and when he was alone ; I spoke to him about the great historical events and labours which I had in view ; about the times of the fall of the mediæval papacy, from the period of the transference of the papal residence to Avignon, to the councils of Constance and Basle. He said it was an important and noble period of history to take up, if one did not, as was usually done, bring out only the evil then existing, which indeed I am noways disposed to do."—(P. 72-4.)

His impression of the Romanist academical training at Breslau are as follows :—

"Breslau, as a Catholic faculty, which still in some measure maintains itself by its opposition to Protestantism, has only to see the importance of coming to know such institutions as they ought not to be. Dereser is the only liberal Catholic theologian here, but he bitterly complained to me about his position. Warned by previous mishaps, he teaches in a higher orthodox manner, and must express himself so in all his intercourse with those about him. Scholtz, and especially Pelka and Haase, are old men, around whom everything has changed, while they remain as before. Köhler is a Jesuit, in other respects next to Dereser, the most reasonable of them all. The students come generally superficially prepared from the gymnasium ; the whole philosophical and theological course is limited to three years. The professors, for the most part, are not respected by the students. The episcopal "Alumnat" is a mere caricature of what a clerical seminary ought to be. Here the young men seem to aim by hypocrisy to strive for the respect and love of their superiors, which they cannot acquire by intellectual or moral qualifications. A profound indication of the head at the "Gloria patri" is the proof of devotion ; the breviary in the hand when a superior approaches, the surest prognostic of honestly fulfilling the office of their calling ; and a casuistical manual for the use of the confessional is about the only source of instruction which they care about for becoming good doctors in after times. During the three years course there is not one examination. All is expected from the consecration which one receives from without, nothing from the consecration which one has from within."—(P. 75-7.)

There is, in two of his latest letters (from Memoirs) to Frau Gorres, and Clement Brentano, a singular account of a Tyrolese Extatica named Crescentia Nigglutsch. In the visions and stigmata of this poor young woman, Möhler seems fully to have believed ! He had seen and conversed with her.

The Life is not very well arranged. There is a want of fusion between the part which we owe to Wörner, and that to which we are indebted to Gams. Contradictions on various points occur between the two, which probably a little more care on the part of the latter might have removed. There is

a bitterness of tone towards Protestants, which Möhler himself never showed. We could have desiderated a more full account of the intercourse which, during his Munich residence, Möhler had with the two Gorres, Baader, the brothers Brentano, Philipps, and other Romanist celebrities.

The Bavarian capital was then as much the intellectual headquarters of Romanism as the Prussian was of Protestantism, and something better than the fragmentary and unsatisfactory notices in the last chapter of the second section of the volume might surely have been forthcoming.

In both the works before us, Gams has followed the plan of indicating publications posterior to the time of Möhler's life. This is useful to the readers of the church history, but seems scarcely called for in estimating the reviews.

Möhler seems to have contemplated the publishing a Church History that should, once for all, be for the Germany of our day, what the histories of Natalis Alexander, Fleury, and Tillemont, had been for their time in France—the Catholic Church History. The warm admirer of Neander, he sought to be, in this field, his Protestant rival. There were already, and the number greatly increased during his latter years, various Romanist manuals, of one or two volumes size. But a thoroughly satisfactory large history did not exist. The work of Count Stolberg was the production, not of a professional theologian, but of a well informed layman—all the more zealous, indeed, because a convert from Protestantism; the work of Katerkamp was more pleasing and judicious than profound, and wanted almost all reference to authorities; there was, therefore, abundant scope for Möhler's ambition. It would have been a worthy life-long occupation. But time was not given him for it.

The work on our table is the sketch, not the picture. Widely printed as these volumes are, they hardly contain more matter than the manual of Ritter; they comprehend less matter than the manual of Allzog. And this makes it the less satisfactory, when we find some parts of the narrative elaborated at disproportionately great length, while others are hurried over. The book is a valuable one to those who are entering on the study of church history, but it is disappointing to those who have made greater progress in the study. We extract some of the remarks on St Bernard:—

“ Bernard had much to do with allaying the differences in the Roman Church, and with bringing back the refractory inhabitants of the seven-hilled city to their allegiance, but he had also rendered the greatest service to the Church in general; and therefore did not shrink from laying before the Pope with the utmost freedom the abuses, which he at least believed to have found, especially in the

highest ranks of the hierarchy itself. This he effected in the five books, 'On Consideration of One's Self.' The work is dedicated to P. Eugenius III., who was chosen to the chair of St Peter in 1145. Eugenius was a scholar of Bernard, and belonged to the same order, so that the saint thought himself amply justified in giving him a word in season.

"Bernard had remarked, for he was a keen observer of men, though a monk, that persons occupied with public affairs were apt to neglect a salutary self-inspection. That his beloved papal pupil might not err in this way, he exhorts him to much self-scrutiny, and so obtain man's highest blessing, consecration and union to God. The Pope ought to be a pattern for all priests; the Roman Church for all churches; the Roman state for all states. But the Roman clergy were deficient in moral earnestness and moral dignity. Three especial abuses existed,—the frequent appeals to Rome, the exemption of abbots and bishops from metropolitan control, and the legateships."

After giving the essence of the book in these connections, Möhler proceeds:—

"This work of St Bernard is an especially important source for the history of the papacy in the Middle Ages; it is so, not only from its contents, which make it valuable to every clergyman, for in it is a true mirror of clerical life, but also from its presenting a picture of the times as they were. We must bear in mind that here St Bernard has undertaken the office of a censor,—of a judge of the morals of his time. The censor is like the priest at the confessional, one who has only the evil before him,—what needs amending. He is silent about the good, or he will have it yet better; he will have the good without a shade; he is always desirous that men should mount from a lower to a higher degree of virtue. This is the duty of the censor; he cannot act otherwise. But the function of the historian is entirely different. It is his business to contemplate offices and persons in the mass; he has to delineate both good and evil, to weigh the one against the other, to view the whole bearing of the times, and see what was practicable in the circumstances of the case. Appeals were customary to Rome, because local judges were either incompetent for their office, or had no power to carry out their sentences; legates had often been useful by contributing to the extinction of slavery, the making up peace between contending neighbours, the revivifying the decaying custom of provincial councils."—(II. pp. 395–405.)

This defence, however ingenious, really evades the matter of Bernard's accusations. And is every dark page of secular history, as well as ecclesiastical, to be softened down because the historian may be conceived as passing into the function of a censor?

Möhler thus describes the later mystical tendency of the Middle Ages:—

"In the writings of Peter d'Ailly, there are already manifest the traces of a mystical direction, which at this period became very

powerful, and spread itself in far wider circles than before. His famous scholar, John Gerson (1363–1429), also Chancellor of the University of Paris, and of great service in the removal of the Western Schism, was rightly termed the Mystic. His whole effort was to divest interest from argumentative speculation to mysticism. He blames the forwardness and combativeness of theologians who often lost themselves in mere verbal quibbles. He complains that philosophy had yielded far too much sway in theology. It was high time to educe a mystical theology from repentance and love. The mystical theology, says he, is a knowledge of God by experience, of which we become possessed in the embrace of uniting love. It is simple and foolish, but far more elevated than a boastful wisdom. He prefers to Thomas Aquinas St Bonaventura, and alongside of him the Victorines; and of the fathers, Augustine and the supposed Dionysius the Areopagite. The mystical writings of Gerson are numerous,—we name among them his ‘Considerations on Mystical Theology,’ and his ‘Treatise on the Mount of Contemplation.’ Gerson does not despise a deeper knowledge of the great divine truths, but expects this to proceed from a perfection, to which the wearisome efforts of mere speculation could not attain, but which would issue out of an immediate supernatural contemplation. Nicolas of Clemangis (1360–1440), nearly connected with Gerson, and, like him, zealous for the unity of the church, in recommending the life of prayer to the heartless speculatists of his time, shews himself here also at one with his friend. But especially must we direct attention to a number of men who, proceeding from the school of Master Eckhardt (d. 1329), as they wrote in the German language, are called the German mystics. The greatest among them were John Tauler (d. 1361), Henry Suao (d. 1365), both, like Eckhardt, belonging to the Dominican order, and John Ruysbrock. Many of them, as the author of the ‘German Theology,’ published by Luther, and Master Eckhardt himself, did not keep themselves entirely free from pantheistic errors. One of the most unexceptionable—the most acceptable fruit of the ‘Mystik’ of the fifteenth century—is the well known little book of ‘The Imitation of Christ,’ by Thomas Hammerken, usually called a Kempis (d. 1471).”—(II. 576–8.)

The two works on our table will perhaps not extend, but will maintain the reputation of Möhler. It might have been interesting to have had a specimen or two of his sermons. But he probably set little store by productions for which, in constant academical labour, he had, once made a professor, no more occasion. He was a learned, candid, and able defender of Romanism, but we have no reason to believe that either the “Symbolik,” or any other of his works, has proved the means of leading, either in Germany or out of it, any to Rome. Confirm Romanists they may, convert Protestants they will not.

IX.—GENERAL LITERATURE.

Bishop Percy's Folio Manuscript. Edited by JOHN W. HALES, M.A., and FREDERICK J. FURNIVALL, M.A., assisted by Professor CHILD and W. CHAPPELL, Esq. Vol. I. and Vol. II. Part I. London: Trübner & Co. 1867.

More than a century has elapsed since the "*Reliques of Ancient English Poetry*" startled the conventional proprieties, and upset the critical canons of a dull and formal age, and it is only now that we are having a glimpse of the mysterious MS. to which that elegant work owed so large a measure of its inspiration. The poor eighteenth century has been so well abused, that a reaction in its favour is not unlikely to set in. We would not, therefore, swell the chorus of detraction, now dying away to feeble echo, further than by remarking, that its worst characteristic appears to us to have been a thoroughly self-satisfied repose in comfortable doctrines of finality in all things, which was fatal to originality in anything. Its literary mechanism, good and useful for one generation, because it was its own honest devising, and because it yielded appropriate expression to its best thoughts, became for two succeeding generations a mere pattern for imitation, an external form uninformed by life. An adapted classicalism, bearing about the same resemblance to the ancient models that the domestic decorative styles of the age bore to the architecture of Greece or Rome, was regarded as the sum of perfection. Everybody, with or without an idea to communicate, had acquired a proficiency in its manipulation. It was a level dusty highway, whence few had the courage to turn aside into green lanes and pleasant fields, for even there some absurd pastoral masquerade, with painted shepherdesses, would mar the scene. The publication of Dr Percy's three small volumes of ballad lore, in 1765, marked the dawn of a new order of things, by ushering in what is known as the romantic school, yet was this a timidly vindicated adventure on his part. It is thus we occasionally see the modest work of the student compassing an object, perhaps dimly enough perceived by himself, that no amount of popular agitation or extensively organised propagandism could have reached. The time was ripe for the change, and other influences were at work more or less intelligently in the same direction. Sundry stiff and vapid imitations of our early poesy had roused an interest in the originals. The recollection of Addison's admiring reference to the glowing words uttered by Sir Philip Sidney over the ballad of the *Chery Chase*, was still fresh in the minds of an untoward generation, which had reared artificial fountains over England's Helicon. Thomas Warton was exhuming the forgotten treasures of our elder poets, and Horace Walpole was feeling his way darkly, and with pardonable error, to a revival of Gothic taste. These first indications of a great revolution in literature and art are now commonplace references, although at the time of their manifestation no such results were predicated. The influence of the Gothic renaissance, however, has hitherto been

chiefly confined to letters. The fine arts are yet of younger and sicklier growth in England, but its literature will ever bear imperishable memorials of the bright after-glow of romance. If it culminated, as has been said, in the brilliant achievements of Walter Scott, who might never have sung of border chivalry but for the happy inspiration of the "Reliques," while as a boy he lingered with them under the old plantane tree at Kelso, there is still an autumnal glory in the Arthurian Idylls of our laureate. In what direction the next transition may tend, we are not in a position to speculate. Such questions are only answered by the events. Each young modern school, according to its predilections, may flatter itself upon a desirable ascendancy, or be disquieted with vexing thoughts of neglect and oblivion, but when the inevitable change occurs it will assuredly be traced back to its inceptive stages. Perhaps, nay more than perhaps, its unmistakeable signs are lying unobserved amongst us at this moment. "In thus dealing with our literature," however, as Professor Morley has well observed, "when we parcel it out however aptly into periods of this influence and that, let us remember that all such distinctions are in their nature arbitrary. Changes of literary taste are never so abrupt that all writing in one fashion ceases when a new fashion first becomes predominant." But whatever befalls, we are safe to say that the influence of romance is now on the decline. The trick of its style has been imitatively caught by hosts of camp-followers, and the term romantic has already acquired an equivocal meaning. Its magnificent results, nevertheless, are, with us and with our children, an inalienable heritage. Possibly the popular element in the romance period, as represented in the homely ballad of the common folk, may yet yield fresh beauties to our literature, but the praise of high-born dames has been sung, and the bravery of knights and squires must sleep at Abbotsford.

Percy has been blamed, say rather savagely attacked, by Ritson and others for having dishonestly tampered with the originals of the ancient pieces of poetry he gave to the world as the select remains of the bards and minstrels. He cannot, however, be charged with moral, as with literal, unfaithfulness in this respect, that is, with designedly misleading the public; for in his preface he gave clear notice both "to the judicious antiquary and to the reader of taste," that considerable liberties had been taken with the old copies. "The editor," he remarked, "could seldom prevail on himself to indulge the vanity of making a formal claim to improvement, but must plead guilty to the charge of concealing his own share in the amendments." The various collections of which he availed himself were duly specified, and many of them were within the reach of jealous inquirers. The greater part, however, of the poems was "extracted from an ancient folio MS. in the editor's possession, which contained near two hundred poems, songs, and metrical romances. This manuscript," he added, "was written about the middle of the last century, but contained compositions of all times and dates, from the ages prior to Chaucer to the conclusion of the reign of Charles I." The authenticity of the MS. was further vouched for by "the author of *The Rambler*, and the late Mr Shenstone," but the former did not stand a willing godfather at

its new birth, while the latter would have done his best to disguise it in the more fashionable costume of the early Georges. Notwithstanding all this, its very existence was called in question by those who had probably never known the treasures that lay buried in our old poetry, save through the medium they reviled. What strikes us, therefore, as most unaccountable, is that the bone of contention was not promptly removed by the publication of the disputed folio. In 1794, nearly thirty years after the first appearance of the "Reliques,"—the Bishop being yet alive, but, sooth to say, rather put out at his own success, and disposed to apologise for his concern with "the barbarous productions of unpolished ages,"—a full description of it was given by his nephew and namesake, in an advertisement to the fourth edition. Here is the account, in certification of which a long muster-roll of witnesses is recited,—"The MS. is a long narrow folio volume, containing one hundred and ninety-five sonnets, ballads, historical songs, and metrical romances, either in whole or in part, for many of them are extremely mutilated and imperfect. The first and last leaves are wanting; and of fifty-four pages, near the beginning, half of every leaf hath been torn away, and several others are injured towards the end; besides, that through a great part of the volume the top or bottom line, and sometimes both, have been cut off in the binding." Such then is the outward description of this famous anthology, which is only now seeing the light, through the indefatigable endeavours of Mr Furnivall, who, at the instigation of Professor Child of Massachusetts, is thus relieving English antiquaries from a too well-merited reproach.

Joseph Ritson was in his thirteenth year when the "Reliques" first appeared, and it may plausibly be assumed that they first determined the bent of his mind. If so, he was either ungrateful or inconsiderate in turning upon his instructor with the ugly snarl he did. He was, no doubt, a more accurate critic than Percy, and indeed he largely assisted in placing antiquarian studies upon a strict and scientific basis, but even his work is now subjected to a scrutiny which discloses his want of precision, and his inexcusable liberties with early texts. His latest commentator declares "all the publications of Ritson to be of far less intrinsic value than is commonly imagined;" and he ventures the assertion, that "if any one should presume, at the present day, to produce texts as abounding in blunders as those of the antiquary in question, he would be an object of ridicule and contempt to all competent judges of the manner in which early English literature should be edited." Mr Carew Hazlitt has, in this and similar deliverances, paid back a few coins of Master Ritson's own mint, which we regret to find in modern literary currency. Of the Percy-Ritson controversy, we may briefly observe that the graceful antiquary having excited the taste, and gradually prepared the public palate, it was ready to relish more of the like pabulum, and when his industrious follower came to cater for this appetite, it could dispense with condiments. The verdict as given by students, it must be said, is generally in favour of Ritson, who would have rejoiced in the unearthing of this folio, but the popular voice has long been for "the heir-male of the ancient Percies," as the Bishop fondly esteemed himself, albeit the son of a grocer at Bridgenorth. The case in con-

tention is exhaustively stated by Scott, who judiciously sums up all the arguments, *pro* and *con*, in his introduction to the "Border Minstrelsy." Before quitting this minor detail, we may pertinently add, that Dr Johnson, while acknowledging that Percy had conferred grace and splendour upon the study of antiquity, could not resist the temptation to parody his imitations of the ancient rhymes, in such jingles as the following :—

"I put my hat upon my head,
And walked into the Strand,
And there I met another man,
With his hat in his hand."

In these lines we may discover two things: the first, that if the old ballad had not been popularised, the parody would have been nowhere; and the second, that the simplicity of the romantic diction, which subsequently inspired the Lake school, was an indignity to be resented by the artificial stylists of the day.

It is time, however, that we gave some brief notice of the contents of the Percy folio, and of the manner in which it is being edited. But first let us tell how it was recovered from the oblivion which has overtaken so many similar collections, in the words of an endorsation penned by its moderately appreciative possessor, whose name it will ever bear. "This very curious old MS.," so runs the inscription, "in its present mutilated state, but unbound and sadly torn, I rescued from destruction, and begged at the hands of my worthy friend Humphrey Pitt, Esq., then living at Shiffnal in Shropshire, afterwards of Prior Lee near that town, who died very lately at Bath, viz., in summer 1769. I saw it lying dirty on the floor under a bureau in the parlour; being used by the maids to light the fire." Much thus did Addison encounter *The Two Children in the Wood*, "one of the darling songs of the common people," pasted upon the wall of a country house. And glad should we be if in some such fashion we recovered any "prophane" originals of the Scots "Godlie Ballattis," a reprint of which, we may suitably allude to in this connection, as having just passed the scrupulous revision of Mr David Laing. The various editions of the "Reliques of Ancient English Poetry" contain in all about one hundred and eighty pieces; whereof "some few are of later date," as advertised in the title, to wit, the polished productions of such wits as Glover, Tickell, Mallet, and Grainger; and many others are sophisticated versions, adapted from the Pepysian, Ashmolean, or other collections. Hence, and from such notice of the celebrated folio as has been vouchsafed, we may infer that it was no more exhausted than it had been accurately followed. An additional interest thus attaches to the printing of the MS., the text of which, we believe, is now all in type, although but a portion has been annotated and published. Reckoning the supplementary sheets, the number of pieces already issued amounts to one hundred and thirteen, so that, with the promised Life of Bishop Percy, subscribers may look for something like other eighty-two. We say, subscribers, because they are wanted. The preparation of the work has been attended with considerable expense in money, and its projectors are naturally desirous to recover

the outlay. But it is the outlay in money alone that is wanted back,—the labour in love being quite irredeemable,—and a few more subscribers at a guinea have still an opportunity of obtaining an invaluable literary curiosity, at the bare cost of paper and printing, while assisting to relieve from pecuniary obligation those who have undertaken this laudable enterprise in the interests of our noble language and literature. Having on this wise button-holed our readers, and surprised them into the amenities of a bookselling canvass, we invite them without more ado to send their subscriptions to Mr Furnivall, at No. 3 Old Square, Lincoln's Inn, London.

This gentleman, whose name is familiarly associated with the Philological and early English Text Societies, is mainly responsible for the text of the poems, which has been left substantially as it stands in the MS. No attempt has been made to restore earlier readings, where arrivable by collation with older and exacter versions, the object being to reproduce the long hidden folio of the seventeenth century pure and simple. Introductions intended to afford all needful information to the unskilled reader, and well fulfilling that intention, are given to the several pieces. The most of them are written by Mr Hales, who also contributes an interesting Essay on the Revival of Ballad Poetry; a few of them are reprinted from the "*Reliques*;" and Mr Furnivall, besides supervising the entire work, in the midst of his other formidable labours, has found time to add a few "happy prologues to the swelling themes" of minstrelsy. One of these is prefixed to the legends of *Merline* and *King Arthur's Death*, incorporating a statement of the evidence for that hero's historic existence, by Mr Pearson of Oriel College, author of "*The Early and Middle Ages of England*." The editor of *Le Morte Arthur*, from the Harleian MS., is well entitled, however, to be heard on this subject, and in his yet indeterminate judgment, the true creator of Arthur's story, as we know it, is Geoffrey of Monmouth, whose fictions, bred of the "unbridled lust of lying," have enriched the world of art, and become a possession for ever. "To the brilliant court of Henry II.," in his estimation, "we owe the chivalry of the legends; to the crusades of the Lionheart the crowning glory of them, in *The Quest of the Holy Graal*, the purity of which has made the Arthur legends shine with a moral lustre not their own." Another essay of Mr Furnivall's has arrested our attention. His introductory notice to a poem entitled *Conscience* is so exceedingly admirable, that, by way of best utilising the space at our disposal, we shall abandon, in its favour, our original intention of quoting and comparing bits of Percy's folio with his polite renderings. It is refreshing to find a living and breathing soul in a Dryasdust, not "conferring grace and splendour on antiquity," nor attempting to foist our contemporary life upon the past,—putting new wine into old bottles, to the spilling of the one and the marring of the other,—but honestly endeavouring to discern the life that was actually in the past, by the light of human sympathy and conscientious study. After a brief reference to the wrongs and oppressions of the poor in former and in later times, and shewing that then, as now, there were earnest social reformers, and protesters against injustice and abuse,—for are not the poor ever with us that we may not disclaim the keep-

ing of our brother, but accomplish our probation in charity?—the writer proceeds to point out that our early literature breathes many a patriotic aspiration for truth and right. “I can bear witness,” he declares, “to the deep impression made on me by the noble and fervent spirits of our early men, rebuking the selfish, denouncing the hard-hearted, calling down God's judgment on the oppressor, striving in their time, too, to leave the land better than they found it. As one looked backward to these sources of the river of English life, one heard a great murmur of wrong rise from the currents, one saw the stream turbid with the woes of humble folk, but there were never wanting voices ordering the one to be stilled in orderly channels, and the other cleared. To their honour, be it said, our early writers were on the weak man's side against the strong, and did what in them lay to lessen the vice of the world. It is this which makes the lovers of them not only surprised but indignant at the willing and wilful ignorance in which men of our day remain with regard to them. Our moderns will not take a few days' trouble to master their language; they care little for their thoughts; but when once the readers of the nineteenth, or is it to be the twentieth? century awake to the recognition of the fact that there is an Early English Literature worth studying, they will be ashamed of their countrymen's long neglect, and gladly acknowledge the value of the treasures they will find—food for all the best impulses of the human soul. So far as I know,” he continues with genial warmth, and we would modestly endorse his opinion, “justice has never yet been done to this spirit of our early literature by any writer on it, except the latest,—Professor Morley. He, a man of mind akin to that of our old men,—ever backing the right and fighting the wrong—has come to the old books, and said to them, not only, What were you translated or altered from, what manuscripts are there of you? but first and mainly, What do you mean? what has the spirit of your writer got to say to the spirits of me and men here now? And the old bones (that were nothing to so many) have taken flesh again, and answered him, have stretched out their hands and gript his as a friend's; and he has put down their answer for us in his own way in divers places of his genial and able book,”—to wit, *English writers before Chaucer*, and *English writers from Chaucer to Dunbar*, of which three vols. are out, and the sequel in course of publication by Messrs Chapman and Hall. What green oases in antiquarian deserts may we not be guided unto by men who are fired with such honest enthusiasm in their work! And that theirs is not a disturbing heat of temper prejudicial to coolness of critical judgment, but a necessary condition of equanimity, we for our own part are satisfied. This general measure of approbation, with special recognition of other individual merits, will be accorded by discerning readers to all the kindred spirits who have had a hand in editing this work. Let us refer to another essay before us, that of Mr Hales, on *The Robin Hood Ballads*. Through the pseudo-historical character of this popular hero, he traces the significant lineaments of truth, underlying its mythical features. It was in a degenerate age that Robin Hood was classed with thieves and highwaymen. In such part of him as really or presumably existed, he was an outlaw in days when law

was unequal, tyrannous, and fierce ; and "an archer bold" among a nation that was passionately attached to the use of the longbow, whether under its own green leaves or in the battle fields of France. But above all, he was a yeoman, not merely as bearing the yew, but as the sturdy advocate of the cause of popular freedom. "Robin, then," writes Mr Hales, "is the people's hero. He is the ideal champion of their cause ; the helper of their extreme necessities ; their great knight-errant and avenger ; the representative freeman who spurns at the harshness of the laws, especially the forest laws, and stoutly upholds his independence ; the more equal distributor of riches, transferring from the opulent to the indigent.

The widow in distress he graciously relieved,
And remedied the wrongs of many a virgin grieved.

Thus," it is said, "the outlaw of Barnesdale grew to be the acclaimed hero of the English commons, as King Arthur became the hero of the higher classes. As the aristocratic period passed away, and the third estate advanced in power and importance, the great yeoman rivalled the great knight. Robin Hood with his merry men of the greenwood, Little John, and Scarlet, and Much, displaced King Arthur with his knights of the round table, Lancelot, and Gawain, and Tristram. The archery meeting presently superseded the joust as the national pastime. The lance is shivered, so to speak, and the longbow wins the day." "This hero of the people," it is added, "was a man after the people's own heart. He reflects the popular character, and is in this way most interesting and important. He is open-handed, brave, merciful, given to archery and venery, good-humoured, jocular, loyal, woman-protecting, priestcraft-hating, Mary-loving, God-fearing, somewhat rough withal, caring little for the refinements of life, and fond of a fight above all things." We may supplement this sketch by the remark, that if Robin Hood were not exactly an ecclesiastical reformer, he more or less articulately sang the people's prelude to the great religious revival which followed. While counselling his merry men on their predatory sallies to spare the husbandmen who tilleth with his plough, and any knight or squire who may prove a good fellow, the rapacious churchman is marked as fair game :

"These byshoppes and these archebyshoppes
Ye shall them bete and bynde."

And there is much in his traditional character that is typical of the spirit of Chaucer's words : "Thilke that thay clepe thralles ben Goddes people ; for humble folk ben Christes frendes ; thay ben contubernially with the Lord,—certes, extorcious and despit of our undirlinges is dampnable."

Here we must abruptly take our leave of this valuable contribution to the history of English language and literature. We should have divided our attention with the fantastic old text of the book, but we have allowed the uncommon interest of the editorial portion to engross our space. We had marked for special reference several passages, equally vigorous and delicate, in these rough metrical compositions, which we must now let alone ; and indeed it were almost impossible,

by singular instances, to convey anything like an adequate notion of the extent and variety of this poetical miscellany. Its unknown compiler may be credited with the possession of multifarious tastes and discursive sympathies, for in such a work as he set himself or others to, we may assume an intelligent appreciation. It is an epitome of a busy, struggling, fighting, laughing, loving, sorrowing world, thoroughly in earnest, full of direct simplicity, and not without its relative lights of faith and truth.

“ Various and strange was the long-winded tale ;
And halls and knights ; and feats of arms displayed ;
Or merry swains who quaff the nut-brown ale,
Or sing enamoured of the nut-brown maid ;—”

Thus, and at much unquotable length, sang Beattie of the “mighty masters of the lay,” whose acquaintance he chiefly made through Percy’s *rifacimento* of this manuscript, and the oral tradition “of the north countrie.” Among the first fruits of the romantic revival, inaugurated by the “Reliques,” was the “Gothic structure” of *The Minstrel*, and its author is not to be blamed if he then only discerned the life of the dim past in its external aspects. It is a poem which not remotely suggested the maturer “Minstrel” of Scott, and the “Childe Harold” of Byron, while it assisted in dissociating the classic echo from the simple music of nature. How much of our modern literature might have been cast in other moulds, had not certain maidservants been interfered with, a hundred years ago, in a matter of kindling fuel, it were difficult to say. LAICUS.

The Essays of Elia. By CHARLES LAMB. With a Dedication and a Preface, hitherto unpublished. Edward Moxon & Co., London. 1867.

Eliana : being the hitherto uncollected writings of Charles Lamb. Edward Moxon & Co., London. 1867.

The Essays of Elia and Eliana. By CHARLES LAMB. New Edition. Bell & Daldy, London. 1867.

Messrs Moxon & Co., in advertising “the only complete and authorised editions of Charles Lamb’s works,” as issuing from themselves, assure us that the above edition of “Elia” possesses the author’s “explanation of his Pseudonym, now published for the first time,” and that “all other editions are therefore incomplete.” Messrs Bell & Daldy assert that their edition of “Elia’s Essays” is “by far the most complete ever published,” and that it appears “by arrangement with the proprietors, Messrs Moxon & Co.”

We are unable to reconcile these statements, and content ourselves with an indication of the points of difference and agreement between the presumably rival editions, in reference to which they are made. The preface and the dedication of the first consist respectively of twenty and of twenty-one lines, but though so brief, they show unmistakeably the touch of the vanished hand. The Essays are so perfectly rounded off by these characteristic sentences, that we cannot imagine why they have been so long withheld. In them we seem to see the “small half-clerical man” receiving his reader at the vestibule, with a hesi-

tating pedantry, and with the urbane civility of the old school. The explanation of the imperishable pseudonym, however, we certainly had somewhere before, although not perhaps in the express words of him who lent it so unique a significance. The fact is, that the real but shadowy Elia, whose name is so happily perpetuated, was an Italian, a fellow-clerk at the South Sea [India] House with Charles Lamb, who "clapt down his name" to avoid personal recognition in one of his essays. But this "poor Elia, the real (for I am but a counterfeit) is dead," writes Lamb in 1821, "so the name has fairly devolved to me, I think; and 'tis all he has left me." Assuredly, few such nominal legacies have been so honoured in the devolution, and as to the assumptive legatee, his right there is none to dispute, for there is practically no Elia but he.

But if the one edition of the Essays is ushered in by these few words, so essential, as we think, to their extrinsic unity, the other before us has restored sundry passages in the text, enclosed in brackets, and variegating some eighteen pages, besides furnishing an appendix of the fastidious author's "redundancies," which, with illustrative notes, cover eight-and-twenty. At the first we feared some indiscretion in these restorations, but are sensible of none, for "Elia" having passed into history, the quest of the literary ferret is become legitimate. "Suppressed passages" are ever as sweet a temptation as forbidden fruit. Some of those under notice were withdrawn, we are told, for purely personal reasons, no longer to be so esteemed; but we cannot help thinking that Lamb himself would hardly have appreciated his present editor's industry in the matter. For has he not specially avowed, "no curiosity to disturb the elder repose of MSS.?" Those "*varice lectiones*," he avers, "so tempting to the more erudite palates, do not disturb and unsettle my faith. I am no Herculean raker. The credit of the three witnesses might have slept unimpeached by me." And again, in a note now printed in the appendix, he says, "I had thought of 'Lycidas' as of a full-grown beauty—as springing up with all its parts absolute—till, in an evil hour, I was shewn the original written copy of it, together with the minor poems of its author, in the library of Trinity, kept like some treasure, to be proud of. I wish they had thrown them into the Cam, or sent them, after the latter cantos of Spenser, into the Irish Channel. How it staggered me to see the fine things in their ore! interlined, corrected! as if their words were mortal, alterable, disposable, at pleasure! as if they might have been otherwise, and just as good! as if inspiration were made up of parts, and those fluctuating, successive, indifferent! I will never go into the workshop of any great artist again, nor desire a sight of his picture till it is fairly off the easel: no, not if Raphael were to be alive again, and painting another Galatea." Let us ask the reader if these lines do not contain at once the condemnation and the amplest justification of the restoring work to which we owe them? It is too bad, however, to palm off Lamb's famous letter to Southey,—from whence the essay on "The Tombs in the Abbey" was extracted,—as original matter in the Appendix, considering that Sir Thomas Talfourd, whose editorial oversight is paraded in justification of these scrapiana, had already included it in his careful edition.

Then as to the "Eliana": we know not to which of the editors belongs the credit of so felicitous a title, bestowed upon these "excellent productions of so excellent a writer," that have been so long "underkept and down supprest." The edition of Messrs Bell & Daldy, which appeared first, consists of twenty-eight "papers, contributed to various magazines and miscellanies, which are almost unknown to readers of the present day:" whilst that of the Messrs Moxon contains all these articles but the last, which is merely the rough draft of a letter, given by Talfourd, as re-written, and is additionally enriched by other thirty pieces. Of this number, four are styled essays, five are tales, six are poems, fourteen are letters, and one is a farce. The twenty-seven pieces, common to both editions, are essays. It is remarked by the later editor, that "the king's chaff is as good as other people's corn," and we think the proverb very aptly cited in this reference. With some of the tales most readers are already familiar, but several of the essays have only been known by name to the present generation, and many others have not even been heard of as such. Albeit, not to be compared with Elia's best and most finished productions," it is thought "many of the articles in this collection contain some of the finest qualities and peculiarities of his genius; and most of them are, as good old Bishop Hall would say, flowered with the blossoms of learning and observation. All true lovers of the gentle, genial, delightful Elia," it is added, "to whom almost every word of their favourite author's inditing is

'Farsed with pleasaunce,'

will be mightily pleased with these productions of his inimitable pen, now first collected together." Of that there can be no manner of doubt, although we certainly had made up our mind for a bit of bookmaking on the part of the gleaners after Talfourd. Nevertheless we could dispense with the "Saturday's Dinner" of "cold lamb," as served by Moxon; and we prefer Bell and Daldy's arrangement of the excised passages, as bracketted into their original connection. Neither do we like the idea of making separate essays out of scraps which their author had rejected in the revision.

"Eliana" supplies not a few characteristic examples of the style of "the last of the Latinists," but we may not here do more than simply drop the remark. There are many pieces we should refer to, if we had the "time and space" of the philosophers moderately at our disposal. The fuller edition of Moxon has two admirable fragments, which we wish we could quote at length,—one "On the Death of Coleridge," the other the "Autobiography of Charles Lamb." He seems never to have recovered from the shock occasioned by the death of his great compeer, and his half-uttered lament, "grieving that he could not grieve," is more than pathetic. With a line or two from the "briefest autobiography," which appeared in the *New Monthly Magazine* shortly after the writer's death, we shall take our hasty leave:—

"Charles Lamb, born in the Inner Temple, 10th of February 1775; educated in Christ's Hospital; afterwards a clerk in the Accountant's office, East India House; pensioned off from that service 1825, after

thirty-three years' service; is now a gentleman at large. Below the middle stature; cast of face slightly Jewish, with no Judaic tinge in his complexional religion; stammers abominably, and is therefore more apt to discharge his occasional conversation in a quaint aphorism, or a poor quibble, than in a set of edifying speeches. A small eater, but not drinker; confesses a partiality for the production of the juniper-berry; was a fierce smoker of tobacco, but may be resembled to a volcano burnt out, emitting only now and then a casual puff. Has been guilty of obtruding upon the public a tale, in prose, called 'Rosamond Gray,' a dramatic sketch, named 'John Woodvil,' a 'Farewell Ode to Tobacco,' with sundry other poems, and light prose matter, collected into two slight crown octavos, and pompously christened his works, though, in fact, they were his recreations. His true works may be found on the shelves of Leadenhall Street, filling some hundred folios. He is also the true Elia, whose essays are extant in a little volume. He was also the first to draw the public attention to the old English dramatists. In short, all his merits and demerits to set forth would take to the end of Mr Upcott's book, and then not be told truly. He died 18 , much lamented.* Witness his hand—Charles Lamb, 18th April 1827." L'ALCIB.

A Journey in Brazil. By Professor and Mrs LOUIS AGASSIZ.
Ticknor and Fields, Boston. 1868.

"It is hardly more than half a century since, owing to the narrow policy and jealous disposition of the Portuguese government, the greatest traveller of modern times was forbidden to enter the valley of the Amazons, while to-day a scientific errand of a similar character is welcomed and fostered in every possible way by the government of a nation now independent of Europe." So writes Professor Agassiz, contrasting the denial with which Humboldt was met, with the princely reception accorded to himself and his companions, essaying to explore the largest river in the world. It was in the year 1865-6 that the journey under notice was accomplished, and in the year following those great waters were opened to the commerce of all nations. Since that recent date the traffic is reported to have been doubled, and the immense natural wealth of this fertile region is now at last about to be rendered more generally available.

The ignorance which has hitherto prevailed in reference to this luxuriant valley is almost as stupendous as its resources, but the one is being rapidly dispelled in development of the other. The chief European settlements in South America were unfortunately made by men of Latin type, who did not carry with them the germs of that grand popular creed which is identified with the Reformation; and so, if we detach the tropical colouring, we find the face of the new world reflecting the effete forms of the old, in so far as the peninsular colonists had to do with it. But now, after centuries of stagnation, there are indications of approaching prosperity, consequent upon an

* * *To anybody.*—Please fill up these blanks."

infusion of liberal ideas from without, which could not originate within. The great wave of Revolution—doing the surgeon's work among nations as the Reformation did the physician's—has rolled over those distant lands, and the spirit of independence is gradually animating their peoples with unwonted life. It is just a little over forty years since Brazil, the largest South American colony, acquired a separate political existence, and, allowing for her antecedents, she has already made wonderful progress. The form of Catholicism may long oppress her, but, as in Europe, that form will have to accommodate itself to altering conditions, and resile before the advance of a liberal civilization. The blight of slavery is still upon her, but the state professes to have realised the magnitude of the evil, and has ostensibly determined upon its gradual removal. Under the pressure of the war with Paraguay—only just commenced when Mr Agassiz was in Brazil, but still in process, and now threatening the security of the empire—large numbers of slaves have obtained their freedom by entering the army, and the Emperor has set a good example by liberating his black retinue, while the government slaves are also about to be manumitted and enlisted. A better motive and method might have been wished, but we must accept the fact as a sign of the beginning of the end. The Indians are also somewhat cruelly, although it is said illegally, pressed into war service, and this volume gives most unpleasant accounts of recruiting operations among the poor creatures. But the most discouraging feature in the country is the character of its population; the disproportion of the white element, which is only a fourth part of the whole five millions, and the extensive intermixture of races. The greater part of the Amazonian population consists of mulattos, mamelucos, and cafuzos, with all the various blends of these hybrids,—a heterogeneous amalgam of the weaker qualities of the three primary constituents, white, Indian, and negro. The present ruler over the abnormal peoples inhabiting this magnificent territory, is said to be a most humane and enlightened prince. He devotes his entire energies to the welfare and advancement of the country; it is his care that wise and equal laws be enacted, although their enforcement is often attended with difficulty, and he has gathered around him a staff of enterprising and intelligent men to assist him in the furtherance of his plans for improving the condition of the people, and developing the resources of the empire. He evinces the utmost readiness to avail himself of all friendly co-operation, and is deeply interested in scientific undertakings within his dominions. One is thus prepared to hear of the cordiality with which Mr Agassiz was received, and of the truly imperial facilities granted to his expedition. Its expenses were generously defrayed out of the private purse of a New England gentleman, but the liberal encouragement extended by Dom Pedro II., both personally and through his official representatives, contributed materially to their reduction, while ensuring its ultimate success.

Professor Agassiz, a native of Switzerland, has now been upwards of twenty years resident in the United States, of which he became a naturalised citizen in 1863. "At the moment when a general distrust of republican institutions prevailed in Europe," we learn that "it was

a satisfaction to him to testify, by some personal and public act, his confidence in them." His great scientific reputation need not be descanted on in this place. Notwithstanding that some see occasion to differ from him in his geological and anthropological theories, his eminent name is universally associated with the progress of natural science. It was after his health had been impaired by close application to his studies, that some relaxation was deemed advisable, and his life-long desire to visit Brazil determined the direction in which it was to be sought—the essential accessory of pleasant occupation being there also to be found. He felt, however, that single-handed he could accomplish but little in the way of exploration, and while so brooding, a very business-like proposal came quite unsolicited from Mr Nathaniel Thayer, to whom it thus appears we are indirectly indebted for this interesting journal. "You wish, of course," he said to Mr Agassiz, "to give your journey a scientific character; take six assistants with you, and I will be responsible for all their expenses, personal and scientific." This liberal and unexpected offer was promptly accepted, and we need not add that its brief and broad terms were fully implemented. In the same generous manner the proprietors of two lines of steamers afforded the expedition a free transport, the first to Rio de Janeiro, and the second back to New York. Before sailing, the party of experts received an accession in volunteers, but not the least important member was the accomplished lady who has written for our delight this pleasant narrative of travel—a narrative happily interwoven with the extempore lectures, letters, and observations of her learned husband.

After spending some little time at Rio, planning the proposed ascent of the Amazons, and holding interviews with the Emperor, who courteously permitted one of his chief engineers, Major Coutinho, an officer possessing special familiarity with the Amazonian regions, to accompany the expedition, its members coasted northward again as far as Para. This is the chief city on the delta of the mighty river, although, strictly speaking, it stands at the mouth of another river flowing into the Atlantic on the south side of the formidable island which blocks up the mouths of the Amazons. It is necessarily the head-quarters and starting-point of up-river voyages, and it was here that Mr Bates, the English naturalist, who passed eleven years in the 'Mediterranean of South America,' as this vast terraqueous valley is called by the Brazilians, first arrived in 1848. It may be instructive here to note, as evidencing the exuberant profusion of life in this tropical wilderness, that, while Mr Bates obtained 1200 species of insects, Mr Agassiz collected nearly 2000 different species of fishes within its area. The significance of the latter figures becomes apparent to the non-scientific reader, when he is told that all the rivers of Europe united, from the Tagus to the Volga, do not nourish more than 150 species of fresh-water fishes. These researches having multiplied by twenty all the previously known Amazonian species, may well claim to have wrought a revolution in Ichthyology. But such discoveries were not to be made at Para, whither only, as yet, we have followed the expedition. It was conveyed thence in one of the well-appointed steamers of the Brazilian line up the river to Manaus, the central

town on the Amazons, at the *embouchure* of the Rio Negro, its chief northern affluent. The steamer, which had been placed entirely at the disposal of the party, tarried from time to time on the route in order to afford better opportunities of observation. With a view to extend the area of research, Mr Agassiz also broke up his party into detachments, which were dispersed in various directions. The principal tributaries of the great river were thus navigated, and a wide field obtained for collecting specimens. Leaving Manaos, the party remaining with the Professor embarked in the regular steamer for Tabatinga, the remotest Brazilian town on the frontiers of Peru, and called at various stations in passing. Before reaching Tabatinga it was matter of serious debate with Mr Agassiz whether, at that point, he should not at once pass into Peru to visit the first spur of the Andes, with the purpose of ascertaining if any vestiges of glaciers were to be found in the valleys, or whether he should make that frontier town the limit of his ascent, and continue his investigation of the distribution of fishes in the Solimoens or upper Amazons. This state of uncertainty was shortly removed in the following singular manner: "Yesterday morning," writes Mrs Agassiz, dating the entry in her journal from Tefte, "a most unexpected adviser appeared in the midst of our council. Insignificant in size, this individual nevertheless brought great weight to the decision. The intruder was a small fish with his mouth full of young ones. The practical plea was irresistible,—embryology carried the day. A chance of investigating so extraordinary a process of development, not only in this species, but in several others said to rear their young in the same fashion, was not to be thrown away." Accordingly, at Tabatinga, where, by the by, four members of a Spanish scientific commission were encountered, the leisurely descent of the river commenced, although a collecting party was left there, and another was despatched up the Putumayo and the Hyutahy. Such a bare outline of the track of these explorations is needful to shew the ground that was traversed with results so largely contributing to our knowledge of natural history. At Tefte then, where the "queer fish" had turned up, about 200 miles below Tabatinga, the first considerable halt was called. We take this to have been the small town of Ega, visited by Mr Bates, and situated at the mouth of the river Tefte, flowing from the south into the Solimoens. The account of the brief sojourn in the wild solitudes of this locality is highly picturesque, as indeed are the glowing descriptions given in this narrative of the multitudinous life, luxuriant vegetation, and gorgeous scenery of this immense equatorial valley, fretted by its gigantic water-system. These passages are full of exquisite poetry, and of what, for want of a better name, we must call romance. The fairy scenes that are called up in our imagination as we read these pages, are perfectly enchanting, although there is a singular lack of adventure throughout the book. It is not so exciting as the recent works on African travel, and there is scarcely such a thing as a hardship recorded as having been endured, for in truth the worthy Professor may be said to have travelled *en prince*. Less distinguished travellers would therefore do well to bear in mind that, while the river steamers possess every comfortable requisite, there is not a

decent hotel throughout the whole length of the Amazons, and had better provide themselves with such letters as will secure accommodation in private houses. The lady who considerately gives us this hint has got quite accustomed, however, to carry her hammock with her, and sling herself up in an Indian hut, with a sense of enjoyment somewhat akin to that associated with a pic-nic under difficulties.

Following our party of *Savans*, we find them continuing their royal progress from Tefé, where they spent a month, down again to Manaus. At this point, to put it accurately, the majestic volume of waters, known in their mid-career as the Solimoens, and higher in their course between Peru and Ecuador, known as the Marañon, first assume the undisputed title of the Amazons. Our best atlases convey but a faint, and frequently erroneous, idea of the nature and magnitude of the basin of the Amazons, which is well characterised by Mr Agassiz as "a fresh water ocean with an archipelago of islands;" and the valley of the Amazons he describes to be "not a valley in the ordinary sense, bordered by walls or banks enclosing the waters which flow between, but on the contrary a plain some seven or eight hundred miles wide, and between two and three thousand miles long, with a slope so slight that it hardly averages more than a foot in ten miles." The work before us is unaccompanied by chart or plan, but to that of Mr Bates is appended a sketch map of the main bed of the river, fuller than any we have yet seen, and shewing distinctly the extensive studding of islands. Not less remarkable are the number and size of the tributaries, and their intricate connections with the main stream, here insulating large tracts of land, and there eddying into broad lakes. "Indeed, all these rivers," it is said, "are bound together by an extraordinary network of channels, forming a succession of natural highways, which will always make artificial roads to a great degree unnecessary." And, it might have been added, to a still greater degree impracticable to construct, for even pedestrianism is well nigh impossible to the amphibious denizens of this region. In addition to the broader channels, there are innumerable lesser creeks, *igarapes*, as they are styled, overspread with leafy canopies, and teeming with tropical life; and we are sadly tempted to take our readers on a lazy canoe excursion up one of those *cul-de-sac* boat-paths, but, as they might be seduced to linger for an indefinite period in such indolent retreats, we had better take them down river at once. We cannot move, however, without the Professor, and he is off on several excursions. The central situation of Manaus, rendering it a convenient *point d'appui*, we find him and his fellow travellers there now and anon during the best part of three months spent in exploring the Rio Negro and the Maúhes. He visited an important lake on the western side of the former, which geographers have seen fit to ignore, and the latter is described in most maps as the Furo Uraria. It is the long and wide channel which, branching off from the river Madeira, and being fed by eight considerable streams, two whereof are known as Maúhe, greater and less, connects itself at both ends with the Amazons, and secludes the great island of Tupinambaranas. This island is in the middle of one of those bewildering labyrinths, "which," in the words of Mr Agassiz, "would be in itself an extensive river-system in

any other country, but is here absolutely lost in the world of waters, of which it forms a part." It is clear that steam navigation will do more for this aquatic region than railroads.

While on these excursions favourable opportunities of intercourse were had with the Indian aborigines, which we know to be of a lower physique than those of North America, although they display a greater aptness for learning. They have in fact not only adapted themselves in degree to the external forms and more civilised modes of the whites, but, as has been said, they are even blending their blood with that of their civilisers and their negro bondsmen, in a manner and to an extent quite unknown in the North, where such affinities would seem fortunately to be lacking. At the same time that one sees in them the successors, on the same soil, of the races who founded the ancient civilisations of Mexico and Peru, so much beyond any social organisations known to have existed among the northern tribes, it is undeniable that their intermixture with European and African races is yielding an enfeebled population. On this point Professor Agassiz very strongly insists, "Let any one," he says, "who doubts the evil of this mixture of races, and is inclined, from a mistaken philanthropy, to break down all barriers between them, come to Brazil. He cannot deny the deterioration consequent upon an amalgamation of races more widespread here than in any other country in the world, and which is rapidly effacing the best qualities of the white man, the negro, and the Indian, leaving a mongrel nondescript type, deficient in physical and mental energy." And in another place he remarks that "the white population has done little to civilise the Indians beyond giving them the external rites of religion, and that it presents the singular spectacle of a higher race, receiving the impress of a lower one, of an educated class adopting the habits and sinking to the level of the savage." The necessity therefore may well be stated for a better class of whites, and more of them, before any fair beginning can be made in developing the resources of the country. Indeed, so ignorant and helpless is the bulk of the Amazonian population, that, in the midst of unparalleled profusion, famine itself is not unknown, owing to the want of ordinary foresight. And if agriculture is almost entirely neglected in the country, the towns are nearly lacking in the vigour and stir of commercial life. On descending the river, Mrs Agassiz remarked in those that were visited, a uniform aspect of neglect and hopeless inactivity, notwithstanding the beauty of their situation, and the fertility of the surrounding soil. Of the town Monte Alègre, which may be held representative of the rest, this lady has carried home with her an impression more sad than gay. Though one of the earliest Portuguese settlements, it is by all accounts rather decreasing than increasing in population. "In the midst of the public square," so runs the melancholy description, "there stands what seems at first to be the ruin of a large stone church, but which is in fact the framework of a cathedral begun forty years ago, and standing unfinished to this day. Cows are pastured in its grass-grown aisles, and it seemed a rather sad memorial bespeaking a want of prosperity in the place. There is here as everywhere a general aspect of incompleteness and decay, and an absence of energy and enterprise,

making the lavish gifts of nature of no avail. In the midst of a country which should be overflowing with agricultural products, neither milk, nor butter, nor cheese, nor vegetables, nor fruit are to be had. You constantly hear people complaining of the difficulty of procuring even the commonest articles of domestic consumption, when in fact they ought to be produced by every landowner. The agricultural districts in Brazil are rich and fertile, but there is no agrarian population. The nomad Indian floating about in his canoe, the only home to which he has a genuine attachment, never striking root in the soil, has no genius for cultivating the ground." Nature is so prolific that her bounties when in season are gathered at random, and when in her necessarily parsimonious alternations, there follow intervals of dearth. If an accession of the more persistent and provident qualities of the Northern race, roughly styled Anglo-Saxon, be desiderated, as we gather from the learned professor's remarks, he certainly does his best to re-assure intending settlers on the score of climate, which he states to be in the main salubrious, and far more moderate in temperature than is commonly supposed. The prevalence of intermittent fevers, malarious diseases, and leprosy, is however an ugly item in the inventory, and although Mr Bates avers that foreigners are not liable to the last of these, he tells us of his personal acquaintance with the others.

The exploring party spent nearly three months in the vicinity of Manaus before sailing down the Amazons, now greatly increased in volume by the periodical rains. The continual vapour-bath induced by the summer heat, which is said to be so great that one cannot move ten steps without being drenched in perspiration, now gives place to another, in which the atmosphere itself is exhaling with moisture; and yellow fever and dysentery frequently hold revel until spring. Everything is penetrated with dampness; and when the hot sun comes out upon the soaked and steaming earth, it is far more injurious than in the dry season. It was now the middle of winter, but in that monotonous green world, where the chief variations consist only in a little more or less heat and moisture, the seasons are very imperfectly distinguishable to northern eyes. The semi-annual changes of the river level, however, impart a new aspect to the country, and a different character to the landscape. The old landmarks are obliterated, banks are overflowed, rocks are covered, cascades and channels are drowned out, and strange burdens are borne seawards on the yellow flood. These consist of quantities of detached grass, shrubs and timber, with soil attached; floating gardens, sometimes half an acre in extent, generally inhabited by water birds, and occasionally by large animals, such as deer and tigers. But we must also take the tawny river at the flood, if we would be led to the end of our story. Passing Villa Bella, Obydos, Santarem, and Porto de Moz, where a large volunteer collection of fishes awaited Mr Agassiz, we touch at Gurupa and Taja-puru, and finally reach Para again,—that is to say, Professor Agassiz did, in February 1866, having spent six months up the Amazons. From Para, excursions to the coast were made, and the great island of Marajo was visited: thus were other seven weeks passed in the delta, as ordinary men like ourselves will call it, after being told that

there is no proper delta there. There being no mention of the matter, it was probably too early in the season to observe the strange conflict of waters which takes place at spring-tide at the mouths of the Amazons, when the colossal wave of the Atlantic overwhelms the majestic flow of the river, with the roar of a vaster Niagara. The immense collections made by the expedition, in all departments of natural history, but chiefly ichthyological, were despatched home, free of charge, by the United States consul at Para; and the industrious collectors coasted thence back to Rio de Janeiro to take a state leave of Brazil at its capital, stopping at Ceara on the way, and making a dash on the interior. As regards the important scientific results of the journey, they are rather hinted at than specified in this narrative, as the work of comparison, classification, and description must necessarily be the slow labour of many years. The only purely scientific chapter in the book is that on the physical history of the Amazons, and it is entirely taken up with the geological formations in the valley, and illustrations of the glacial theory.

With a description of Rio de Janeiro and its public institutions, and discriminating remarks on the political, social, and religious condition of Brazil, this interesting volume comes to a close. Mrs Agassiz discovers an utter want of harmony between the institutions and the actual condition of the people. "May it not be," she asks, "that a borrowed constitution, in no way the growth of the soil, is, after all, like an ill-fitting garment, not made for the wearer, and hanging loosely upon him? There can be no organic relation between a truly liberal form of government and a people for whom, taking them as a whole, little or no education is provided, whose religion is administered by a corrupt clergy, and who, whether white or black, are brought up under the influence of slavery. Liberty will not abide in the laws alone; it must have its life in the desire of the nation, its strength in her resolve to have and to hold it." The writer of these strictures had abundant means of observation in the best society of the country, and she is naturally inclined to look at the bright side of things; but the darker shades predominate. The sombre character of the people is typical of that moral melancholy which has infected her. With a sympathetic feminine touch, she depicts the dreary and monotonous life of the Brazilian senhora; and if the position of woman in any country be a true criterion of its progressive or defective civilization, judgment must go against Brazil. The old Portuguese notions about shutting women up, and making their home life as colourless as that of a cloistered nun, still prevail in most parts of the stereotyped colony. Many a Brazilian lady, it seems, passes day after day without stirring beyond her four walls, scarcely ever shewing herself at the door or window, for she is always in slovenly dishabille, unless she expects company. She cannot go out of her house, except under certain conditions, without awakening scandal. Her education, although including a little French and music, leaves her wholly unacquainted with the most common topics of interest; the world of books is closed to her; she knows little of the history of her own country, and less of that of others; she is hardly aware that there is any religious faith except the uniform one she finds around her; indeed, of all but her own stifled existence—at

which it is something to say that she repines—she is profoundly ignorant. The senhora thus, it is said, either sinks contentedly into a vapid, empty, aimless life, or frets against her chains, and is discontented and useless. In this connection we may note the terribly significant fact that books are seldom or never to be met with in Brazilian houses, not even the fazendas of the wealthy planters. But we fear we have drawn overmuch upon the patience of our readers, who may fail to derive, through our summary, a measure of that interest we have found in perusing this work. We have attempted no criticism, for so far as that implies fault-finding, we have none to make; and our approval of the book is, we think, fully implied. Let us conclude by retailing a very characteristic incident, more suggestive of the actual state of Brazil than many tables of statistics. It is Mrs Agassiz again whom we quote—

“ The other day, in the neighbourhood of Rio, I had an opportunity of seeing a marriage between two negroes, whose owner made the religious, or as it appeared to me on this occasion, irreligious ceremony, obligatory. The bride, who was as black as jet, was dressed in white muslin, with a veil of coarse white lace, such as the negro women make themselves, and the husband was in a white linen suit. She looked, and I really think she felt diffident, for there were a good many strangers present, and her position was embarrassing. The Portuguese priest, a bold, insolent looking man, called them up, and rattled over the marriage service with most irreverent speed, stopping now and then to scold them both, but especially the woman, because she did not speak loud enough, and did not take the whole thing in the same coarse, rough way that he did. When he ordered them to come up and kneel at the altar, his tone was more suggestive of cursing than praying, and having uttered his blessing, he hurled an amen at them, slammed the prayer-book down on the altar, whiffed out the candles, and turned the bride and bridegroom out of the chapel with as little ceremony as one would have kicked out a dog. As the bride came out, half-crying, half-smiling, her mother met her, and showered her with rose leaves; and so this act of consecration, in which the mother's benediction seemed the only grace, was over. I thought what a strange confusion there must be in these poor creatures' minds, if they thought about it all. They are told that the relation between man and wife is a sin, unless confirmed by the sacred rite of marriage; they come to hear a bad man gabble over them words which they cannot understand, mingled with taunts and abuse which they understand only too well; and side by side with their own children grow up the little fair-skinned slaves, to tell them practically that the white man does not keep himself the law he imposes on them. What a monstrous lie the whole system must seem to them, if they are ever led to think about it all. I am far from supposing that the instance I have given should be taken as representing the state of religious instruction on plantations generally. No doubt there are good priests who improve and instruct their black parishioners; but it does not follow because religious services are provided, that there is anything which deserves the name of religious instruction. It would be unjust not to add the better side of the

question in this particular instance. The man was free, and I was told that the woman had received her liberty and a piece of land from her master as her marriage dower."

On the whole, it appears to us that, while dispassionately balancing its merits and demerits, Professor Agassiz takes a more hopeful view of the future of this country, than the lady's narrative alone would warrant. It may be he has visions of northern traders and speculators in the rear. He deeply feels that there are elements of a high progress in Brazil, that it has institutions which are shaping the country to worthy ends, and that it has a nationality already active, shewing its power at the present moment in carrying on one of the most important wars ever undertaken in South America. In her conflict with Paraguay, he reckons Brazil among the standard-bearers of civilisation. That war, he affirms, originated in honourable purposes, and is not maintained for selfish ends. And he adds, that "it deserves the sympathy of the civilised world; for it strikes at a tyrannical organization, half-clerical, half-military, which, calling itself a republic, disgraces the name it assumes."

LAICUS.

XII.—GERMAN LITERATURE.

Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie. Herausgegeben von A. HILGENFELD, Doctor und Professor der Theologie in Jena. Elfter Jahrgang. Erstes Heft. Leipzig. London: Williams & Norgate. 1868.

This quarterly journal for scientific theology has won for itself a good place, during the past eleven years of its existence, among the number of theological journals in Germany. The Lutheran University of Jena, in the Grand-Duchy of Saxe-Weimar, originated in the time of the Reformation. As the scene of the labours of the philosophers Fichte, Schelling, and Hegel, it attained to great celebrity at the close of the last and the beginning of the present century. These professors were ultimately removed to Berlin; but their lectures to the crowds of admiring students who gathered round them at Jena, gave a powerful impulse to the course of speculation pursued at that university. They impressed upon it the character which it long retained. It has now, however, recovered from the blighting influence of Rationalism, and holds a very respectable position among German universities. Dr Hilgenfeld is its chief ornament. He is the author of a valuable work entitled "*Novum Testamentum extra Canonem receptum*," containing such remains of antiquity as, "*Clementis Romani Epistolæ*," "*Barnabæ Epistola*," "*Hermæ Pastor*," &c., illustrated by a critical commentary and notes. He is also a frequent contributor to the journal he edits. The number mentioned above, the first of the current year, contains

five papers. The first is by Dr Hanne, Professor of Theology at the Evangelical Protestant University of Greifswalde. The subject of it is the Origin of the Human Race viewed in relation to Modern Theism. The conclusion of the article, containing the results to which the author is conducted, will be given in next number. We have here also the continuation and conclusion of a critical commentary on the Gospel of Matthew, by Dr Hilgenfeld. The third article is by Rönsch of Lobenstein. The author introduces his subject as follows :—

“The treasury of manuscripts, gathered together by the industrious monks from Ireland, at the monastery of Bobbio, near Alessandria, from which already the so-called ‘Fragment of Muratori’ was obtained last century,—a fragment of great value as regards the history of the New Testament canon,—has recently yielded a second gift to the theological world of considerable importance. This second fragment belongs to the department of Jewish Apocryphal literature. In a torn and dilapidated condition, it had been deposited in the Ambrosian library of Milan. The learned custodian of the library, A. M. Ceriani, has deciphered it and put it in order, and published it along with other manuscripts which have been also rescued from destruction. This parchment fragment, consisting of eight cartons, written in the Latin language, in the idiom of Italy, but very probably translated from a Greek original, is without division of words, and only very seldom is any punctuation in uncial letters to be met with. Hence it has been concluded that the codex belongs to the sixth century, and was probably brought from Ireland by Columban, the founder of the monastery. We have here exclusively to do with that part of the Fragment lately brought forth from the halls of the Ambrosian library, which contains the beginning of the ‘Assumptio Mosis,’ or ‘*Ἀνάληψις Μωυσέως*,’ which was from the second to the eleventh century of the Christian era, an important devotional book of the ancient church. It is not only expressly quoted by several ancient fathers of the church (as Origen, Didymus of Alexandria, and Evodius), but also in the acts of the Nicene Synod, as the Adscensio, or the Assumptio, of Moses. It is of considerable importance to the Biblical critic, as having a bearing on the judgment that may be formed regarding the Epistle of Jude and the second Epistle of Peter of our New Testament canon.”

“As might have been supposed, so interesting a fragment drew toward it, as soon as it appeared, the attention of several men of note in Germany. These vied with each other in their endeavours partly to remove the difficulties of the hand-writing, partly to fill up the blanks which were found in it, and partly to explain the import of the text thus restored. We particularly make thankful recognition of the able performances in this direction of these two learned men who had already distinguished themselves by their labours in kindred departments of scientific pursuit, viz., Professor Hilgenfeld of Jena, and Professor Volkmar of Zurich.”

The work of Dr Hilgenfeld, referred to by Rönsch, was published in 1866. It appeared as an appendix to his edition of the Letters of Clemens Romanus, under the title of “*Mosis Assumptionis quae supersunt primum edita et illustrata*.” Volkmar’s work was published last year. It is entitled “The Prophecy and the Ascension of Moses.”

It is a translation of the Fragment into the German language, with a facsimile of the codex and the chronological table. Rönsch uses Volkmar's edition in the remarks he makes on the subject. His paper is a contribution towards the clearing up of certain difficulties in the language of this remarkable document. The peculiar construction of sentences, and the government of words found in it,—such *e.g.* as in the phrases “sine quærellam,” “palam omnem plebem,” &c., &c.,—he accounts for by referring them to the forms of expression then in use among the people of Italy and of the provinces, who hesitated not to violate the rules of grammar observed by the classical writers. The article shews wonderful research, and a great breadth of observation. It contains an immense mass of verbal parallelisms, from many sources, intended to illustrate the remarkable usage of words and expressions found in this ancient manuscript.

Theologische Studien und Kritiken. Jahrgang. 1868. Zweites Heft.

In this old and well-known quarterly journal of theological literature, there is always a good supply of valuable and ably written articles. This part contains (1.) an elaborate article on “Justification by Faith,” by Dr C. J. Riggerbach, Professor in the Swiss University of Basel, who is already favourably known as the author of “Die Mosaische Stiftshütte” (the Mosaic Tabernacle), a second edition of which was published last year, and “Die Zeugnisse für das Evangelium Johannes,” which contains a comprehensive and lucid statement of the evidences in favour of the genuineness of the Gospel of John. In the article before us Riggerbach says, “The doctrine of Justification by Faith, which was, in the time of the Reformation, one of the chief points of severance between the two confessions, and by Luther was designated ‘*Articulus Stantis et cadentis ecclesiæ*,’ and was regarded by the reformers generally as the very palladium of Christianity, has been defended since the time of the reign of Rationalism not always in the old way. Many protestants have, in their advocacy of it, approached the popish form of the doctrine; yea, even men who have hitherto stood forth as the zealous representatives of the church doctrine, have occasionally uttered expressions which would have been sternly repudiated in the time of ecclesiastical strictness. Even Hengstenberg, in his discourse on the Epistle of James (Evang. Kirchen-Zeitung, Nov. 1866), has, with many excellent remarks, recorded opinions which scarcely agree with the old protestant church doctrine.”

“What, however, has at present induced us to direct attention to the doctrine in question is, the highly important contribution on this subject by Romang in the *Studien und Kritiken*, I. and II., 1867. It is interesting, in treating this subject, to compare him with Döllinger, who has discussed the same question in his great work, ‘*Christenthum und Kirche in der Zeit der Grundlegung*’ (1860). Here we meet with a Roman Catholic, with whom the polemic against Protestantism passes quite into the background, because he writes altogether as a biblical theologian. While in some things he shews the

doctrine of his church, in others he expresses himself almost more protestantly than Romang the Protestant; yet, on the other hand, he especially applies himself to build up a system of doctrine more in harmony with the education and the philosophy of the present day, than with the doctrinal statements of the ancient church. He handles the question more as a philosopher than as a theologian. He seems to attach little importance to his theological training."

"The fact from which Romang takes his start is one that is indisputably manifest, viz., the estrangement of very many in our times from the church and the church forms of Christianity, and the wide diffusion of a spirit of hostility to all that is called dogma, or is dogmatic. As a means of remedying this state of things, many recommend the formation of a people's church, without any dogmas, to which it is more than doubtful whether the name of church could at all be given; for Romang rightly observes that, without some agreement in matters of doctrine and common persuasion, as to the chief points, no church can stand. The endeavour to gain the educated classes who are estranged from the church by concessions, which would go the length of giving up the very foundations of the gospel, can never truly gain a single individual. They seek to persuade the children of this world, as an unconscious mass, and, so to speak, in an anonymous way, that they are much better Christians than they had thought themselves to be. Truly it is not so with the gospel, that its salvation is obtained in so unconscious a way. Naturalism is not Christianity. If there is in the sphere of politics a method of concession which leads to the beheading of the king, so there is, in matters affecting the gospel, a concession which leads to the shipwreck of the faith. I am not to be misunderstood, as if I regarded Romang as specially an enemy. The following paper will shew how much I respect him, even when I am constrained to oppose him."

After thus introducing his subject, and expressing his great satisfaction at finding so much that is commendable in Döllinger, Riggenbach proceeds to deal with his subject under the following heads:—
 1. Common fundamental principles; 2. Justification only by faith; 3. In what sense is justification by faith? (a.) Justification by faith is not a false judgment of God; (b.) It gives no countenance to a state of moral slumber; (c.) Faith is not viewed as a virtue, but as a laying hold of Christ. 4. Is justification an act, or a progressive work? 5. Paul and James. As a specimen of his argument and of his doctrine, we quote the following sentences under this last head:—
 "The justification by works, and not by faith alone, which James teaches (ii. 24), comes into sharp contradiction, as far as the sound of the words is concerned, not so much to Paul's doctrine, but to Luther's translation of Rom. iii. 28, where he adds, for the more distinct bringing out of the meaning, the word '*alone*.' The complaint made by the Romanist, that herein the Scripture is falsified, is without foundation. For, in the course of the argument in the Epistle to the Romans, the entire exclusion of the works of the law from any part in our justification, warrants the statement that justification is by faith *alone*. But yet the addition '*alone*' is unnecessary,

and, besides, is of doubtful propriety, as it easily awakens the thoughts which James so earnestly, and with right, guards against. It seems as if the discourse were about a '*faith*,' which is not only '*alone*' in justification, but which also remains '*solitary*,' i. e. without the fruit of works. We know that such was not Paul's meaning." After quoting and reasoning on certain passages in James, he says, "We thus see that, if each of the apostles uses in part a different terminology, it is principally because they have before them different opponents, yet, in the deeper import of their doctrine, they agree." The reconciliation of Paul and James has been a very puzzling question to the Germans. It is well known that Luther made very short work of the matter, by rejecting the authenticity of the Epistle of James altogether. He spoke of it as an epistle of straw (*die stroherne Epistel*). Riegenbach rightly says, "If we have Christ, we are justified." But he falls into the error of supposing that there is a justification at our first entrance into the new life, and that, as there are stations and stages in the course of life, so there is, not a being justified more and more, but a being justified ever anew, and an increase in its ratification, onward to the end of life. This renewed justification is by works which are the fruit of faith.

The best and most satisfactory way of reconciling the apparent discrepancies between the statements of Paul and James on this subject is, in our opinion, that which is so well set forth by the late Dr Wardlaw, in his sermons on the subject, viz., "That Paul is speaking of justification *in foro Dei*, and James of justification *in foro ecclesiae*."

The next article is an exegetical exposition by Dr Groos of Coblenz of the word *κρίσις*, as used by the apostle John. It is a very learned dissertation. It is followed by an article on Master Eckhart's doctrine of the soul in connection with his general doctrine. Eckhart (Aichard) was one of the philosophical mystics of the fourteenth century (died 1329). He was provincial of the order of the Dominicans in Cologne. His general views of doctrine were more of a pantheistic character than were those of any other of the mystics. Though he did not in all things agree with the brethren and sisters of the Free Spirit, yet in all probability he stood in a close relation to them. His numerous writings were suppressed by order of the ecclesiastical authorities, and only fragments of them have come down to modern times. They seem to have produced a deep impression on the age in which he lived, and to have given an impulse towards the revival of piety by the labour of the mystics who succeeded him. His doctrines were condemned as heretical by Pope John XXII. A.D. 1329.

This number contains also a scholarly criticism on the doctrine of the Logos, consisting of two parts; (1.) John and Philo; (2.) John and the Old Testament. It is from the pen of Röhricht of Berlin. Dr Gaab's "*Der Hirte des Hermas*," Basel, 1866, and Dr Graf's "*Die Geschichtlichen Bücher des Alten Testaments*," are reviewed at considerable length. Notice is taken also of the important work published at Leipzig last year, entitled "*Appendix Codicum celeberrimorum Sinaitici Vaticani Alexandrini. Cum imitatione ipsorum antiqua manu Scriptorum nunc primum edidit Aenoth. Frid. Con-*

stantin. Tischendorf." Dr Laurent, who writes the notice, says, "Tischendorf here gives us, 1st., *Two Fragments of the Codex Sinaiticus*. These Porfirio Uspenski, a learned Russian bishop, who, like Tischendorf, had several times visited the Monastery of St Catherine at Sinai, had found buried in the bindings of old manuscripts, and brought to light. The editor is of opinion that they are of high antiquity. Porfirio entrusted his discovery to Tischendorf. It is now, for the first time, published by him after the great four-volume folio work, which contains the "Codex Sinaiticus." This fragment consists of portions of Genesis and of Numbers."

"More interesting still is the second contribution which we have here, viz., sixteen large folio pages from the much spoken of, and yet little known *Codex Vaticanus*, which Angelo Mai first edited, it is true, but as is well known insufficiently. In an audience with his holiness Pius IX., our honoured countryman Tischendorf obtained permission to use the Codex for the occasion. The Pope declined, however, to allow him to issue an edition of the whole Codex, which he wished to do after the manner of the Sinaiticus, because he intended himself to undertake the work. Of all that Tischendorf has said in the Prolegomena about the handwriting of this Codex, the most astonishing is that which he has announced concerning its age, and concerning its writer: *The Vatican New Testament is written by the same hand by which the Sinaitic New Testament was written!* The Vaticanus, therefore, like the Sinaiticus, belongs to the fourth century. The two Codices were not copied from the same, but from different manuscripts."

The third portion of this "Appendix" is a new accurate impression of Clemens Romanus. Every scientific theologian knows the high value of this document, the nearest to the apostolic times. Thirty editions and translations of the Epistle to the Corinthians have appeared. Yet it is also well known that the impression of the text has been hitherto untrustworthy and imperfect. Neither in respect of the defects, nor in respect of the readings of this well-known manuscript, the Codex Alexandrinus, had there as yet been obtained any certain information. Understanding this, and considering that the sorely dilapidated Codex could not be any longer exposed to the ever repeated handling, the managers of the British Museum resolved to have the whole manuscript photographed. This was done, but the condition of the handwriting is such as photography cannot in all cases reach. The writing is in many places illegible, the paper has become yellow, and is torn; besides, a tincture of gall which was poured over the text for the purpose of making the letters more distinct, has so disfigured and darkened many of the pages that the photograph is frequently only a dark, illegible, shadowy island. It was therefore fortunate that Tischendorf, with his great experience in reading manuscripts, should have had the opportunity of examining this Codex as he wished. The splendid result of this is the valuable appendix of the first epistle of Clemens to the Corinthians, which forms a part of that Codex.

Zeitschrift für die historische Theologie. Jahrgang, 1868. Drittes Heft. Gotha Perthes.

This number of the journal for historical theology contains, 1. An account of the Life and Times of *Philip Gallicius* (born 1504). The writer presents a somewhat lengthened sketch of the religious agitations by which the Reformation in Germany, and mainly in Italy, was accompanied. The article, indeed, might be described as a history of the rise and progress of the Reformation in Rhætia down to about the year 1550. 2. *The Life of the Monk Marcus*. This monk was a disciple of Chrysostom's, and the contemporary of Isidore of Pelusium and Theodoret. He is not much referred to by church historians, not even by Neander, though the author of this article, Dr Ficker of Schönberg, in the kingdom of Saxony, makes it manifest that Marcus was a man of note in his time, and that his writings are a satisfactory evidence that the doctrine of the Reformation is not, as the Roman Catholics affirm, "*res nova et inaudata*." The three articles which follow are by Dr Schmidt. The first of these is the copy of a document entitled "*The Confession of John Fredrick the Magnanimous regarding the Interim*." It was written by him when in prison, with the intention that it should be published, that the world might see how truly and firmly he adhered to his faith, and that the Interim had not his sanction. This document Dr Schmidt has now for the first time published. The emperor Charles entered into a league with the Pope against the Protestants of Germany. In 1581 the Protestant princes formed a league at Smalcald for mutual defence against every assailant. The conduct of Charles in his efforts to find confederates in Germany in his war against the Protestants, roused the Smalcald confederates to the necessity of preparing for war. John Fredrick, the Elector, took the field with his troops in 1546, but was defeated by the imperial army at Mühlberg. He was taken prisoner, and condemned to death as a heretic and rebel. This sentence was afterwards commuted into that of imprisonment for life. In September 1547, a diet was convened at Augsburg by the emperor. An "*Interim*" was prepared by the Pope's directions, and with the sanction of Charles, with the view of preparing the way for the settlement of the war between the Protestant and the Papal parties. The Interim was a compromise granting certain concessions to the Protestants, but retaining much that was utterly irreconcilable with the Protestantism of the Reformation. The diet made the Interim binding in Protestant states. Some towns submitted to it, but the brave-hearted John Fredrick refused all compromise. His sentiments on the subject, written in prison, are expressed in the document, for the publication of which we are indebted to the care of Dr Schmidt. It brings up before us the struggles and the controversies of those troublous times. It breathes, moreover, an earnest Christian spirit.

The next article is also a document of great interest. The case of the double marriage of the Landgrave of Hesse, and of the part acted by Luther and other reformers in that matter are well known. That is a sad chapter in the history of the Reformation. The document

before us is a copy of what we might call Mennius' pamphlet on that much agitated question. It is an unqualified condemnation of the course taken by the Landgrave. It was originally published under a feigned name. Its title was "A Dialogue, that is a friendly conversation between two persons, on the subject whether it is godly, natural, like an emperor, and a Christian man, to have more than one wife, or the contrary, by Huldericus Neobulus. 1540." This pamphlet must have been very telling. The Elector of Saxony prohibited its publication in his dominions.

This article is followed by "Three Letters on the Interim, by Nicolas Von Armsdorff. 1548," recovered from the archives at Weimar by Schmidt. They are addressed to the princes of Saxony.

Zeitschrift für die gesammte Lutherische Theologie und Kirche.
Jahrgang, 1868. Zweites Quartalheft. Leipzig.

The first article is a dissertation on the doctrine of Eternal Life as taught in the Old Testament Scriptures, founded on the words, "I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob" (Matt. xxii. 29-32). This is followed by a Biblical discussion on Christ's "*Descensus ad inferos*," by Engelhardt. The writer enters very fully into an exposition of his view. He defends what he regards as the doctrine of the old theologians and of the Lutheran Catechism on this subject, and controverts the opinion expressed by Laible in an article in this journal on the same subject in the beginning of 1863. Richter, another Lutheran pastor, has an article also on the same subject as that of Engelhardt's. He follows very much the same track, and at length arrives at the conclusions,—“(1.) Christ went to Hades, and not merely to Paradise but to Gehenna. (2.) His sojourn there was when his body lay in the grave. (3.) His going down was not merely his suffering the *humana lex* of death, his *business* in hades was the proclamation of the gospel, and the offering of the grace of God. (4.) This preaching of the gospel there afforded, not to all the dead without exception, room for conversion, but it *completed* only what had already been *begun* by him on earth. But it certainly brought for those from whom the kingdom of God was far removed, but who also were themselves ‘not far from the kingdom of God,’ the blessings which the people of God were enjoying on earth by the institution of his grace. (5.) The operations of this preaching is the *κρίμα τῆς σαρκός* and the *ζωὴ πνεύματος κατὰ θεόν*. (6.) As regards Christ himself, the ‘Descensus’ belongs to those acts by which he takes possession of his kingdom.”

This number also contains the second part of Paret of Würtemberg's very elaborate and interesting article on "The Law of Development in the region of the Life of Faith." He begins by saying, "We have in the former part presented a descriptive survey of the comprehensive economy of the revelation of God, wherein he does not suddenly pour out his fulness, but reveals his will in the manner of a gradual and continuous development. Our task is now to consider what systematic bearing this fact has on the scientific and practical

life of faith." The subject is treated historically, and many important principles, evolved in the course of the history of the church, are adduced and classified. We quote only these sentences: "In the first ages of the Christian church, faith was more a childlike faith of *immediateness*, in the middle ages it was more the faith of external *authority*, but in the time of the Reformation, it had its roots more deeply in conscious *reflection* whereby the Christian life of faith was brought to manly maturity." The writer concludes by saying, "And now what have we *learned* from this historical investigation of the law of development? I think not only this, that such a law *really exists*, but that a disregard of it, in any department of the domain of truth, is attended with *injurious consequences*, which endanger the Christian life, and are prejudicial to the principle of all development—the 'ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο'; but also that under our hand has arisen to greater distinctness the *line* along which a healthful Christian life has developed itself, the *nerve* on whose support all life rests, the *narrow way* of faith which alone leads to the desired-for goal, the *norm* of orthodoxy between the many heretical deviations and the *foundation* of the development of life with its manifold factors with their reciprocal relation. The *breadth*, the *height*, and the *depth* of the knowledge of Christ, are not, it is true, described in all their fulness, when something of its *length* has been considered; yet, for the present, it is enough to have the eye purged for the contemplation of all the relations penetrating this law by which we become more sober in our judgments and endeavours, and learn rightly to rank ourselves and our times in the totality of the divine economy, which is perfecting itself in historical development."

Zeitschrift für die gesammte Lutherische Theologie und Kirche. Jahrgang, 1868. Drittes Quartalheft.

The articles in this number of the Lutheran quarterly are—1. A very elaborated investigation into the structure and symbolical significance of the Temple, and its sacred furniture, particularly the Ark of the Covenant. 2. An exposition of the difference between the statement of John xix. 14, ("And it was the preparation of the Sabbath, and about the sixth hour," &c.), and that of Mark xv. 25 ("And it was the third hour, and they crucified him"). This article contains a learned dissertation on the mode of reckoning the hours of the night and of the day by the Jews and the Romans respectively. The conclusion the writer arrives at is, that John speaks of the hour according to the Roman mode of reckoning. The chronological arrangement he adopts is as follows:—(1.) At the first night watch 'οψίς, which extended from six to nine in the evening, our Lord was with his disciples in the upper room in Jerusalem, keeping the feast of the Passover. (2.) At the beginning of the second night watch μεσονύκτιον, which was from nine to twelve, Jesus went, with his disciples, to Gethsemane. (3.) At the third night watch 'αλεκτοροφωνία, Jesus stood before the sanhedrim. False witnesses rose up against him. He was accused of blasphemy. Peter denied his Lord, and was brought to repentance. This night watch extended from midnight to three in the morning. (4.)

At the commencement of the fourth night watch, Jesus is brought for the first time before the general council, under the presidency of Pontius Pilate, by whom sentence was pronounced against him. This last night-watch, *πρωτή*, extended from three to six. Both Mark (xv. 1) and John (xviii. 28) agree in the language they use regarding the events of this watch. The former says *ἐπὶ τὸ πρωτὴν*; the latter, *ἤν δὲ πρωτὴν*. In the *Textus Receptus* the word is *πρωτα*; but Lachmann and Tischendorf have *πρωτ*, which is also found in the *Codex Sinaiticus*. Thus, according to Mark and John, it was at third hour of the morning when the High Priest pronounced sentences against Jesus and led him away to Pilate. The writer maintains that the sixth hour spoken of by John (xix. 14) was the sixth hour of the morning; and that the event referred to by John, as having taken place at that hour, was Pilate's sitting down on the judgment-seat. From the time when Pilate took his place on the judgment-seat to the moment when Christ hung upon the cross, three hours passed. This is the *third* hour which Mark speaks of; i.e., the third hour after Pilate had given sentence against Jesus. The *third* hour of Mark corresponds with the hour of nine of the morning according to the Roman mode of reckoning.

Then follows an interesting historical article on the influence of the French nobles in spreading the Reformation in France, by Dr Lotz.

"The Doctrine of the Power of the Keys" is discussed in a few pages by Kleinschmidt, a Hanoverian pastor. The subject is considered Biblically. The writer advocates the "*potestatem jurisdictionis, hoc est auctoritatem excommunicandi obnoxios publicis criminibus et rursus absolvendi eos, si conversi petant absolutionem.*"

The last article is an address by Superintendent Althaus, on the subject of Oaths and the Evils of Perjury. It is practical in its character. It was originally an address delivered at a pastoral conference. It inculcates on the clergy the importance of endeavouring, both in public and in private, to impress on the people the sacredness of an oath.

The second portion of this journal always consists of Bibliographical notices of recent theological works. These criticisms are carefully prepared, and are very discriminating; but it is frequently manifest that a spirit of confessional partisanship imparts a tone of severity to criticisms of an adverse kind, which are dealt out to works by authors of the reformed confession.

Bibel-Lexikon. Realwörterbuch zum handgebrauch für Geistliche und Gemeindeglieder. HERAUSGEGEBEN VON Professor Dr DANIEL SCHENKEL. Erstes Heft. Leipzig: Brockhaus. Edinburgh and London: Williams & Norgate.

This work will appear in thirty-two parts, forming four large volumes. Dr Schenkel, to whom the editorial care of it has been entrusted, is well known in Germany as an ever-ready and zealous opponent of Popery in all its forms. He is an advocate of the union of the Lutheran and the Reformed Churches, and strongly condemns the high Lutheranism which has, within these few years, sprung up into such vigorous life. He is a Swiss by birth, a native of Schaffhausen. He

succeeded De Wette as Professor of Theology at Basel. For some time he was entangled in the critical scepticism of his predecessor, but gradually wrought his way out of it into clear and solid views of Christianity. From Basel he was called to the University of Heidelberg, where he now resides. He is the author of an ably written book, scientific in its character and, at the same time, frequently eloquent in its style, entitled "*Christenthum und Kirche*." The second volume of this work was issued last year. It treats of the various aspects of religion viewed in harmony with the development of culture. The book is very objectionable as manifesting a want of due regard for what is positive in Christianity. He undervalues, even speaks contemptuously of, positive forms of doctrine. He writes as if the doctrines of Christianity were constantly in a state of solution.

This Lexicon is the first of the kind that has ever been attempted in Germany. The publication of Smith's and Kitto's Bible Dictionaries has induced the publisher to enter on the extensive undertaking indicated above. Schenkel has associated with him, in various departments, a large number of able men (more than thirty), who have already acquired a name in Germany. Judging from the first part lying before us, the work will contain a very full and learned discussion of all the subjects comprehended in it. It is designed to be a complete Bible lexicon. It will be abundantly illustrated with woodcuts wherever these are necessary. Its spirit will be that of Evangelical Protestantism. It cannot be expected that a work of such extent and variety, in the production of which so many different authors are engaged, and these *German* theologians, will be in matters of doctrine and of Bible criticism always consistent with itself, or always reliable; yet it may be assumed that there will be no deficiency in the learning, and ability, and thoroughness with which the articles will be written, and that many of them, particularly those of a purely scientific, or geographical, or historical character, will be of permanent value.

Die Verhandlungen des Vierzehnten Deutschen Evangelischen Kirchentages, zu Kiel. 1867.

The proceedings of the fourteenth meeting of the German Kirchentag (Church Diet), held in September last year, were reported so far in the journals of the day. The authorised record of the meeting, containing the papers read on the occasion, and the discussions to which they gave rise, has but recently come to hand. The Kirchentag first met in the year 1848, a year memorable for the political convulsions by which the whole continent of Europe was agitated. From the time of the re-awakening of religious life in Germany, pious ministers and laymen had been in the habit of meeting from year to year in different places in "*pastoral conferences*." By this means a desire was engendered to form a closer union or confederation between the Protestant churches of the Fatherland, for the purpose of mutual counsel and help in the common conflict with ungodliness and infidelity, and that without interfering with the internal economy of any of the churches. This desire found its expression in an invitation issued by

the "conference" of Sandhof, near Frankfort-on-the-Maine, to ministers and laymen of the Lutheran, Reformed, and United Confessions, to assemble at Wittenberg, at the grave of Luther, for the purpose of consulting together on the interests of evangelical truth, and on the duty of the church in the present time. The "conference" had great difficulty in coming to the resolution to call such a general assembly. Their hesitation gave way, however, and all their difficulties and perplexities vanished, when that truly Christian nobleman Von Bethman Hollweg, addressed them in these words,—“It is the Lord, my friends, who builds the church. Never forget this! Whether the assembly spoken of will accomplish what we desire and hope, no one can tell. Our resolution must be an act of faith. Like Peter, we shall have to walk on the sea; but we know also that the Lord does not suffer any one to perish who trusts in him. If we look merely upon ourselves, and upon the scattered, distracted, and weak members of the church, we would have indeed to despair. But if we raise our eyes in faith to him who is the Lord, we may venture it.” Noble words! The "conference," hesitated no longer, and the result of their invitation was the meeting of the first "Kirchentag" of the German Protestant Church at Wittenberg, on 21st September 1848. It was a remarkable meeting for the solemnity and earnestness of tone, and high Christian devotedness by which it was pervaded. It was attended by about five hundred eminent divines, and statesmen, and Christians of all ranks, from all parts of Germany. It was a time of reviving and refreshing from the presence of the Lord. Many warm-hearted earnest addresses were delivered. The glowing eloquence of Krummacher, when at the close of the meeting he stood up, and in one of his most fervent addresses, "pledged the members to stand true to one another in the day of persecution which seemed about to burst upon them, and received, in the prolonged affirmation by the whole assembly, the assurance that they would bear each other as members of one family in their hearts and prayers, would receive each other in the day of persecution to house and home till the storm should be overpast, and would account as their own sisters and their own children, the widows and orphans of the brother who should seal his testimony by the martyr's death." This address melted the whole assembly in tears, and they departed to their homes, not knowing what might befall them in these times of revolution, but strong in faith, giving glory to God. The Kirchentag thus inaugurated, has met every year since, except when special causes hindered its meeting. Its object is to afford opportunity for the free discussion of religious and ecclesiastical questions, and to originate and direct means for the promotion of the interests of practical Christianity in the whole field of the Inner Mission. During these twenty years of its existence, this association has exerted a wide influence on the formation of opinions and on the development of religious life in Germany. The general business of the Kirchentag is arranged by a central committee six months before the time of meeting. The topics to be discussed, and the appointment of the principal speakers is thus all arranged beforehand. The meeting extends over four days. The papers on the appointed subjects are read at the time fixed on, and then there follows a free discussion

on the matters brought up by them. Devotional exercises open and close each sederunt, and in the towns where the meeting may take place, the several pulpits are occupied by the best known preachers who may happen to be present. Two days of the Kirchentag are always devoted to the work of the Inner Mission. In connection with the Kirchentag proper, there are also, at the same time, held meetings of Bible, tract, and missionary, and other religious or benevolent societies. The assembling of the Kirchentag is thus a great occasion in German church progress.

The meeting last year at Kiel brought together a large number of ministers and laymen from all parts of Germany. The paper read on the first day was by Dr Herrmann of Göttingen, on the question, "How far the different Evangelical Confessions in the present day stand in need of an independent ecclesiastical form in order to their beneficial development." The subject gave rise to a very animated discussion, inasmuch as it brought up the great question of the union between the two branches of the Protestant church. No subject at the present moment has deeper interest for the Germans. It is discussed with much asperity by the rival parties. The paper read on the second day was by Dr Dorner of Berlin, on "The doctrine of Justification by faith in Christ, in its relation to Christian knowledge and the Christian life." As might have been expected, this subject is discussed by the learned professor with very great ability. The third and fourth days were devoted to the inner mission. Of this department, Dr Wichern, the distinguished founder of the Rauches Haus, near Hamburg, is deservedly the president. It is a department with which his name has long been honourably connected. The Report was read by Oldenburg, the secretary of the central committee. It set forth briefly yet fully the operations of the mission during the past year. Thereafter Wichern read a paper on the duty of laymen to labour for the advancement of the cause and kingdom of Christ, which was followed by a discussion of the subject by various speakers. On the fourth and last day of the meeting, there was first a discussion of the evils arising from too large congregations, both in town and country. The conference then renewed their protest against gambling houses.

In connection with these meetings of the Kirchentag and the inner mission, or associated with it, there are held at the same time "*special-conferenzen*." The subjects taken up at these conferences were (1.) the revision of Luther's translation of the Bible; (2.) the reform of the mode of public worship on Sabbath; (3.) Sabbath schools; (4.) Bible circulation; (5.) the want of schools and churches among the Germans of North America; (6.) fallen women; (7.) the poor; (8.) young men's associations; (9.) Christian art in the family and in the church.

Biblish-Theologisches Wörterbuch der Neutestamentlichen Gräcität.
Von H. CREMER. Gotha: F. A. Perthes.

Within the last few years very considerable attention has been directed to the elucidation of the New Testament, by an investigation of the precise force and significance of the Greek words employed by the

sacred writers. In this department, Schleusner's "*Lexicon-Græco-Latinum in Novum Testamentum*," long held almost undivided sway. This valuable work is by no means yet out of date. To the theological student it will afford valuable aid. In 1825, Professor Robinson of Andover, published a translation of Wahl's "*Clavis Novi Testamenti Philologica*," and about ten years afterwards, he published a "*Greek and English Lexicon of the New Testament*," which was soon afterwards re-issued from the Edinburgh press under able editorial superintendence. Robinson's *Lexicon* has had probably the largest share of popularity among Biblical students in this country. Old Parkhurst's "*Greek and English Lexicon to the New Testament*," was edited and greatly improved by Rose and Dr Major of King's College, London, a few years ago, and again sent forth to do its work. Dawson's "*Lexicon Novi Testamenti*," translated and enlarged by Dr Taylor of Trinity College, Dublin, has also been republished. The labours of Trench and Webster in expounding the synonyms of the Greek New Testament, have also done very much towards enabling the student more fully to appreciate the exact meaning of the sacred records. From the Leipzig press there has been just issued a new edition of Wilke's "*Clavis Novi Testamenti Philologica*," originally published at Dresden in 1841, under the title, "*Lexicon Græco-Latinum in Libros Novi Testamenti auctore Carolo Ludov. Wilibaldo Grimm, Theol. et Phil. Dort. illiusque apud Jenenses Professore*." Grimm says of the work, that "*ita castigavit et emendavit ut novum opus haberi possit*." This *Lexicon* embodies in it a critical, exegetical, and biblical investigation into the text of the New Testament. But Cremer's work, the title of which we have given above, appears to us to be worthy of special commendation. The author was a student under the venerable Dr Tholuck of Halle, who has devoted his best powers to New Testament exegesis. He recognises and gives due weight to the influence of the Christian element in moulding the Greek language, the "*Sprachbildende Kraft des Christenthums*," as Schleirmacher called it. The sublime doctrines of the gospel could not possibly be unfolded to man without the use of new words, or the imparting to words already in use a meaning, or a shade of meaning, they did not before express. The Septuagint translation of the Old Testament had already prepared in some degree the way for the use of the Greek language in the revelation of the Christian system; it had become "*a viaduct between the two covenants*." Yet the doctrines the apostles had to expound and present to men in written documents, were of such a nature, that, with all its previous preparation, the language had new meanings or deeper meanings infused into its words, and where necessary, new words were coined for the better expression of the truth. The Greek language, thus enriched and modified, becomes a special study, which requires for its successful prosecution not only an intimate acquaintance with its philological history and structure, but also as intimate an acquaintance with and reverence for the doctrines of the gospel. In this spirit Cremer has devoted, amid the labours of his village pastorate in Westphalia, nine years to the preparation of this valuable contribution to the study of the Greek New Testament.

Predigten aus der Gegenwart. Von Dr Carl Schwarz, Oberhofprediger und Oberconsistorialrath zu Gotha. Vierte Sammlung. Leipzig : Brockhaus. 1868. London : Williams & Norgate.

Dr Schwarz has already published three volumes of sermons similar to that now before us. They have passed through several editions, and have gained unwonted popularity in Germany. The author's style is extremely eloquent and lucid. It reminds one more of the best of our modern English writers, than of the heavy and frequently involved style of most German authors. The volume contains twenty-eight sermons, most of which were preached on special occasions. Passages might be quoted of extreme beauty and simplicity. In point of doctrine there is a decided failure in the presentation of the substitutionary character of Christ's death, and of other distinctive doctrines of the gospel. There is also an undue prominence given to that view which contemplates Christianity as a *life* rather than as a *doctrine*. While both statements are true and important, that Christianity is a *life* and that it is a *doctrine*, Schwarz presents only the latter, and thus gives a one-sided view of the subject. It cannot be denied, however, that that one side is very eloquently and impressively stated. There is in respect both of style and matter a close resemblance between Schwarz's sermons and those of the late Robertson of Brighton. Whatever their beauty in composition, and the importance of many of the views of truth they present, the gospel of salvation by the atoning death of Christ is really not in them. Schwarz is the author of a work entitled, "*Zur Geschichte der neusten Theologie*" (The History of the most recent forms of Theology), a third edition of which was published in 1864, of considerable pretensions, but vitiated by the rash dogmatism of the author, and by a strong leaning toward Rationalism.

Die Idee des Menschen, Zweiter Beitrag zur Biblischen Theologie hauptsächlich der Synoptischen Reden Jesu. Von CARL WITTICHEN, Evangel. Pfarrer in Malmedy. Göttingen 1868. London and Edinburgh : Williams and Norgate.

This book is designed by its author to be a sequel to one published by him in 1865, entitled, "*Die Idee Gottes als des Vaters*" (the Idea of God as the Father). It is intended to be followed by a third volume, "*Ueber die Idee des Reiches Gottes*" (on the Idea of the Kingdom of God), which will complete his plan.

This is a work on Biblical Anthropology. Beginning with the history of the creation of man in the book of Genesis, the author presents the different aspects of human nature as they come to view in the successive portions of the divine revelation, particularly in the discourses of Jesus. In his preface he says, "We have here for the first time, as far as our knowledge goes, attempted to set forth the characteristics of the religious anthropology of Jesus, in organic connection with the development of the idea of man within the pre-Christian Hebraism, and also with its wider unfolding in the epistles of the apostles, in an exclusively inductive and genetic method. We

hope thus, not only to serve the cause of biblical theology and the history of religion, but also to supply a contribution toward the answering of questions regarding the historical origin of Christianity, and the character of the reforms of the religious life of man effected by Jesus, as well as regarding the peculiar nature of his religious consciousness, and at the same time for the solution of questions in systematic theology. The representations of the life and doctrine of Jesus hitherto given forth, appear to us in this respect not to accomplish what they ought to have accomplished, inasmuch as, instead of affording a view of the inner process of the transformation of Hebraism into Christianity, they content themselves with simply exhibiting the facts, and viewing the religious conceptions of Jesus more according to their objective form than according to their subjective germination, and the general principles by which they are governed. We are also of the conviction, that only by the help of investigations of this kind will any fundamental reform, in the radical conception of systematic theology, be effected."

Starting with such principles, and with such an object in view, Wittichen has brought out many very important views of truth, and especially of the relation of Christianity to Judaism; but in his pages we see Jesus too much as the representative of the development of the spiritual and religious ideas whose roots are found in the Old Testament. The book is ingenious, and worthy of being read, as opening up new fields of investigation on matters of deep and permanent interest. The reader will, however, find a vagueness in the speculations indulged in, which renders the book altogether unsatisfactory.

Gedanken und Anlagen zu Predigten, u.s.w. Von A. F. C. WALLROTH, Geheimer Kirchenrath, Grossh. Oldbg. Hofprediger. Oldenburg, 1868. London and Edinburgh: Williams and Norgate.

This is a volume of what might be called "Sketches and Skeletons of Sermons," delivered at different times and places since 1831, by Wallroth, the court preacher in the Grand Duchy of Oldenburg. It contains 906 such sketches. They are all of a practical character, and appear to be very suggestive. Some of them are very brief, consisting of only a few lines, while others are more elaborate, and fill several pages. The author designs his book to be of use to preachers. It is an old proverb, "Many men, many minds," and it cannot but be of essential service to preachers to consult the thoughts of "many minds," and place themselves in different points of view in contemplating texts of Scripture. To those who wish to see how German Lutherans handle texts, we recommend this volume of Wallroth's sketches.

Vom Menschensohn und vom Logos. Ein Beitrag zur Biblischen Christologie von Dr L. T. SCHULZE, Madgeburg. Gotha, Perthes 1867. London and Edinburgh: Williams and Norgate.

Professor Schulze merits respectful recognition for this valuable

contribution to the study of biblical christology. He brings to the execution of his task eminent critical abilities, profound scholarship, and reverence for the truth. His work consists of two parts. In the first part he investigates the expression, 'ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, so frequently used by our Lord regarding himself. He presents a very extensive review of the literature of the subject, and, after examining the passages of Scripture where the expression occurs, tracing it from the words of Daniel vii. 13, he arrives at the conclusion that, while it teaches that Christ was truly man, it also comprehends in it the higher idea, that he was "God manifest in the flesh." The second part of the book treats, in a like thorough and scholarly manner, of the doctrine of the "Logos." He finds the germs of the Johannine Theologumenon of the Logos in the Old Testament. He regards the Logos as divine, and argues against the views of Beyschlag, that the word denotes a distinct person, and not a mere abstraction, or property, or impersonal principle. Although the author has not added anything absolutely new to the discussion of the subject, yet the careful, scientific manner in which he has investigated the recent literature of christology renders his work very valuable.

It remains only to notice that it is dedicated to the Theological Faculty of Halle, on the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of the union of the Halle and Wittenberg Universities. The University of Wittenberg was transferred to Halle in 1817, and is now only a theological seminary for students who have finished their university curriculum.

Die Busz-disciplin der Kirche. Von den Apostelzeiten bis zum siebenten Jahrhundert. Von F. FRANK, Curatgeistlicher zu Löhreith in der Diözese Würzburg. Mainz, 1867. London and Edinburgh: Williams and Norgate.

This book is introduced with a Preface by Dr Hergenröther, Professor at the Roman Catholic University of Würzburg. The subject of repentance and forgiveness is here treated from an entirely popish point of view. The writer's object is to exhibit the historical development of the doctrine, from the time of the apostles to the seventh century. He enters into a detailed exhibition of the whole subject of the discipline of the ancient church in regard to penitents; of the "power of the keys"; of absolution; of confession; of the sacrament of penance, &c. Throughout the whole book one cannot fail to see very obviously the prevalence of the *opus operatum* as a fundamental principle with the author. The credit of laborious research, and of intimate acquaintance with the whole matter of which he writes, from his own point of view, cannot be denied to the curate at Löhreith, in the diocese of Würzburg.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
84

are: "The Knowledge of God," 2 vols.; "Logic," 2 vols.; "The Knowledge of the Soul," 2 vols. The new work of this fertile pen is not an abstract treatise upon morals; the science of duty is animated, under the author's hand, by all the realities of life:—"I desire above all things to exhort my brethren and myself to the love of duty, the respect and practice of the law; I desire also that we should console one another,* together on account of the present distress; I have therefore replaced the abstract treatise upon morals, which no one would have read, and which I could not have written, by the spectacle of the moral law in action, by the study of the law of history, a law, the science of which implies the spectacle of the future and the hope of the admirable and divine progress which awaits universal society, provided we remain within the law" (i., p. 17).

What does the author understand by this law? It is the moral code, one and the same everywhere. "There is not one code of morals for the individual and another for society, a political morality and an international morality." There is simply *morals* in the absolute sense, morals, the universal law of history, the necessary law of all human facts, the sovereign law which destroys whatever resists, and vivifies whatever obeys. The law of this moral system is just simply the accomplishment of the words of the Gospel, "*Whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so to them.*" This formula, as short as that of attraction, but simple, as like the law of the heavenly bodies, a complete principle, precisely and rigorously scientific, and it is the principle of a science richer, finer, more important than that of the starry heavens (i., p. 298).

But how is this noble law to be applied? Here again admire the simplicity of the divine plan. We belong to three worlds. The world of nature, that of man, and that of God. Well, three great duties correspond to these three worlds: To replenish the earth and subdue it (Gen. i. 28). To order the whole globe in justice and equity (Wisd. ix. 8). Lastly, the third duty, "which, if well fulfilled, implies the accomplishment of the others, and stands at the very outset of the Gospel,"—to seek first the kingdom of God and his righteousness (Matt. vi. 33). "These are the three great historical circles which Vico caught a glimpse of, without being able to distinguish what each of them contained. He saw, indeed, these three recurring periods always following each other in the same order and then recommence. . . . But these recurring periods only recommence in rising higher and recapitulating themselves. They go on, reducing the labour of each circle, while enlarging the horizon at every step; like those spiral roads which lead from the base to the summit of mountains" (i., p. 300).

In every historical period we must always, 1st, persevere in the law, in spite of obstacles; 2d, arrive at the knowledge of the truth; 3d, by the truth, at the possession of liberty. At all events, these formulas are the eternal laws which Jesus Christ has revealed to the world. The first cause of progress is God (Acts xvii. 23);† the second cause

* *Simul consolai*, Rom. i. 12; *Consolamini invicem*, 1 Thess. iv. 17.

† The author gives here a lucid summary of Buckle's "History of Civilisation"

is man, who finds life by labour and obedience to the law (Matt. vii. 7-12).

Liberty alone can explain the mystery of evil. Without sin society would always rise by divine wisdom, and under the law of labour and the just communication of man to man.

Two of the best chapters in the whole work are those upon *Spoliation* and *Homicide* :—" Spoliation ! in this very year in which I write these lines, the courts of justice in my country have declared themselves to be sitting, as it were in permanence, to judge without intermission, bands of swindlers organised into so-called financial societies, in such numbers, that in eighteen months," to use the very words of the magistrature, " more than forty societies have had to render account to the just severity of the laws of more than 80,000,000 frs. (£8,200,000) thrown into and lost in the gulf of guilty speculation." —(*Moniteur*, 20th March 1866). " At what other period in the history of France, think you, has the justice of the country had to condemn about forty bands, whether armed or not, expressly organised for rapine ? Assuredly, for at least the last eight hundred years such a thing had not been seen. But there were formerly bands that the king's soldiers could not always repress. Do not such bands, unarmed it is true, still exist ? We have not forgotten the cry of the magistrate, ' They are stronger than the law then ! . . . If we must put up with this scandal, all I ask is, that the law should disappear, and that we its ministers should not be condemned to hold it in our hands palpitating, unapplied, vanquished ! ' Who does not see that our laws against gaming are trodden under foot on every side, violated with impunity by those all-powerful financial societies of which the administration boldly is the accomplice ? What then becomes of the judicial authority ? Is it still a distinct power ? But will not this wholesale pillage of the weak by the strong come to an end ? The feudal right conferred by money *shall* come to an end as the other has, by a new emancipation of the communes which is already beginning" (i., p. 111).

In the chapter upon *Homicide*, the author, after quoting the audacious Philippic of Fénelon against war, addressed to the successor of Louis XIV., and the doctrine of the church explained by Bourdaloue and the *De Bello* of Billuart, declares, according to the estimate of Larroque, that war costs Europe the *seven-ninths* of its receipts, a budget secret as well as open, amounting to seven billions of francs ! He repeats with Victor Hugo, that from 1791 to 1814, France alone spent upon military glory five millions of men, that is, six hundred

in England," and raises his voice with just indignation against the anti-liberal theories of the English philosopher, particularly as regards the way in which he maltreats free will ; against his ideas upon the family being made the subject of police regulations ; against the theory that civilisation consists in the triumph of mental over physical laws, but its ulterior progress in the triumph of intellectual over moral laws. " I can only qualify this book," says he, " as a phenomenon of moral and intellectual decomposition, in which all, or very nearly all, is totally devoid of sense. It is a tissue of absurd assertions ; and when, at great intervals, the author does attempt to reason, he shews that he does not even know what reasoning is" (i., p. 84).

men *per diem*, and Europe sixteen millions, that is, two thousand lives *per diem*, during twenty-three years !

L'Abbé Gratry then exclaims :—" Such spectacles have been and continue to be the torture of my life ; I cannot read, without losing a part of my strength for the day, all those recitals of Hindoos tied to cannons' mouths, of the vanquished being impaled, of negroes dying under blows, of cannibals eating each other, of families of slaves sold separately, member by member, of soldiers whose flesh has been torn to the bone by the lash, or of Polish peasants expiring for their faith under the knout. These spectacles crush me down. But yet I will look at them face to face, and make you look at them too. Why ? That they may teach you what life is, and what the world is, and that they may excite in us all that triumphant indignation which is irresistible. This world, our home, is still oppressed and corrupted by Satan. This ignoble and clumsy spirit, this murderous satyr, is still there dancing in blood and tears, his lascivious, stupid, and ferocious dance, which is corrupting and degrading us.

" Above all, ye bloody men, you whom the gospel calls sons of Belial, the chief murderer, you who can cause and behold the torture of others, tremble ! "

" Tremble ! I tell you, you whose heart is full of cruelty, whom Satan holds, whom he forces to slay your own, you the most to be pitied among those tortured by evil, wicked unfortunate ones, almost lost and damned, who might have become the sons of God and have made yourselves sons of Satan, tremble ! " (i. p. 164).

The author concludes this diatribe by the following apostrophe, which has escaped the censor's scissors : " See to what the underground labour of cunning men, of rulers, of skilful men, of fools who think they can carry in their solitary head the destiny of nations, has brought us ! " (i. p. 314).

The *strength which will overcome wickedness* is not in man, but in *Him who taketh away the sins of the world* (John i. 29). Let us not despair. The consequence of the law of history is penetrating into the life of this world ; *the truth shall make you free*. The sun of science is rising. " The spectacle presented to us at the present moment is certainly one of the finest that it has been given to man to contemplate. Man seems ready to start forth, with magnificent vigour, his first great task, necessary in order to conquer and subdue the entire terrestrial globe. Only three centuries have elapsed since we have known and seen with our eyes that the earth is a globe ; and since we have made the tour of it. And, in our nineteenth century, we are beginning to fill the new world, discovered three hundred years ago, with men, as well as that other part of the world, Australia, discovered still more recently. Besides, within the last half century, we have begun to subdue the earth with forces so new, with a science and strength so far surpassing all that the past had hitherto seen, that our forefathers of every age, even of that which created the science, would have attributed what we see to science and magical skill. By this magic of the sciences we have made ourselves natural slaves by hundreds of millions. We have increased a hundred fold the velocity of man upon the earth, and we have spanned the globe with a girdle

which transmits thought from one end of the earth to the other, with the same rapidity as writing or words. Men of all countries speak together now as if they were in the same place.

"It is but yesterday since unity of place has been conquered for the whole world. Now unity of action is beginning for the universal family. We have evidently reached one of the most solemn moments in the life of humanity" (i. p. 248).

Add to these new means of progress the efforts of thinkers to enlighten the world. "Very powerful philosophers, to whom few minds that have appeared within the last hundred and fifty years can be compared, are labouring in common (this is the great point), are labouring, we repeat, in common, from one end of Europe to the other, popularising the greatest ideas, organising modern reason in precision, analysis, deduction, establishing the logical basis in men's minds, and inoculating it into the very constitution of the new languages which have been brought forth by a new world.* Never at any time have so many men simultaneously made such efforts of thought with so much hope and buoyancy" (i. p. 253).

Lastly, and before all, let us point out the unique, incomparable impulse given to the world by the gospel. No, the theory of M. Diard, the author of "Studies upon the Moral Statistics of England and France" is not a true one, viz., "that the world is not being transformed; that humanity is not advancing towards new destinies; that the nature of man does not depend upon his will, but upon a physical organisation which remains the same to-day that it was three thousand years ago. The gospel is there to shew us how to add to our own strength that of God. It is the code which reveals laws and the sources of strength! It will shew us how to avoid losing all our human resources in emptiness, and how to make use of the strength of God" (ii. p. 274).

The author then refers to the passages which prove the progressive nature of the gospel (Mat. xiii. 8, 24, 33; Mark iv. 8; John x. 10). "Progress is the march of God upon earth, it is the working of the Father to bring all beings to the sovereign good; it is the working of the Son to raise himself along with every creature to life eternal, to happiness and love; it is the incessant operation of the Spirit of life and love to teach the child of God to imitate the life of God, in order to enter into the bliss and immortality of God" (ii. p. 287).

The chapter upon *political progress* is an apology of the politics pursued by Great Britain. "Within the last forty years Europe has seen a spectacle never before seen at any time, nor in any place, a people reforming themselves; a multitude correcting themselves; a nation advancing step by step, little by little, through reason and liberty, towards justice and peace, and this progress continuing and accelerating for half a century" (p. 263).

It would be difficult to surpass the praises that the author lavishes on America since the great act of emancipation. In allusion to Lincoln's speech, "Woe unto the world because of these scandals," cries he; "there is henceforth but one nation, and that nation, by

* This has been shewn by Sir Wm. Hamilton.

the voice of its head, has pronounced the most evangelical words that the head of any nation ever pronounced to the world since the gospel has been proclaimed upon earth " (i. p. 140).

Under the title of *social progress*, the Abbé Gratry returns again to his favourite theme, and gives a long description of the morality of the young factory girls at Lowell. He calls this spectacle "*the sublime in history*, one of the great works of Christian civilisation, greater than any miracle that has been rendered possible in the bosom of contemporary society by the gospel, *et majora horum faciet*" (ii. p. 816).

We cannot help asking why the author, who speaks incessantly of the gospel as the primary cause of this progress, and lauds up the two great Protestant nations, says nothing of Spain or Italy, of the Roman Catholic nations who hide this gospel under the bushel? Again, in tracing the upward march of humanity, why does he leap over the Reformation of the 16th century? Is it because he did not feel at liberty to speak with fairness of this great moral transformation on account of those by whom he is surrounded? Is it for the same reason, and to escape the ecclesiastical censure, that he speaks of the reformers, Luther and Calvin, as having inspired the judges who raised the stakes in Spain (i. p. 162)? Certainly, the discovery is a new one! But we prefer passing over what might wound our Protestant feelings in these eloquent pages, radiant with faith, and, we may add, well adapted to teach thousands of believers who understand nothing of the dogma of the unity of the church; members, it may be, of the Evangelical Alliance, and yet hardly knowing how to tolerate brethren whose theological opinions differ from their own.

The chapter, *Duties towards the human kind*, which terminates the work, merits our most serious attention. What Christian would not repeat with the Romish priest: "I believe that the greatest means of moral and religious regeneration that we at present possess, would be to proclaim and shew to the people in detail, and to preach in every village of every Christian country, that the time is come when God is requiring of the elder brethren of humanity, the European people, the accomplishment of the great duty of man, which is, *the setting in order of the whole globe in righteousness, union, and peace?*"—(Wisdom, x. 2, 8.)

We are conscious of having done justice to the Abbé Gratry's book, but notwithstanding his noble mind, we are convinced that, like the efforts of Montalembert, Cochin, de Broglie, to change the face of the world, his labours cannot succeed, and must remain comparatively sterile. Like Jansenism, the catholicism of these enlightened men is a compromise, and we may put to them the question of the historian of the Reformation, Merle d'Aubigné: "Why is it that, while the consequences of the Reformation have been so great, Jansenism, rendered illustrious by the finest geniuses, has died away without strength? It is because Jansenism made a compromise with Rome, and tried to establish an even balance between truth and error, while the Reformation, leaning on God alone, cleared the ground, removed all the human rubbish which had covered it for centuries, and laid

bare the primitive rock. To stop half way is useless work ; in everything, we must go on to the end. Therefore, while Jansenism has passed away, the destinies of the world belong to evangelical Christianity" (iii. liv. xi. ch. 9).
C. de F.

XIII.—CRITICAL NOTICES.

Ethics of Theism: a Criticism and its Vindication. By the Rev. ALEXANDER LEITCH, Author of "The Gospel and the Great Apostacy," "The Unity of the Faith," &c. Edinburgh: Andrew Elliot. 1868.

Mr Leitch is favourably known in the theological world as the author of various excellent works. His principal publications, "The Unity of the Faith," "Christian Errors Infidel Arguments," "The Gospel and the Great Apostacy," and "Heart Religion, or Living Faith in the Truth," all display literary and philosophical qualities of a high order, and give him a distinguished place among our modern Christian authors. Mr Leitch has shewn himself an original and independent thinker, well versed in the philosophy of the day, and possessed of great metaphysical acumen. He has specially attended to modern theistic arguments, and the tactics of our living Christian apologists. He is by no means satisfied with the line of defence often adopted by the professed champions of truth in their reasonings against the atheist or the infidel. Nor is he certain that even the best of these defenders of the faith do not often injure their own cause by falling into inconsistencies, and employing fallacies in argument which their acute opponents can hardly fail to detect, and to take advantage of in defending error. In one of his more remarkable works, "Christian Errors Infidel Arguments," he does not hesitate to accuse of logical slips, and argumentative fallacies, Mr Thomson and Principal Tulloch, the two last Burnett Prize men, and even such practised Christian apologists as Isaac Taylor and Mr H. Rogers, author of "The Eclipse of Faith." It required not a little boldness on the part of a retired country minister to break a spear or two with each of these redoubted champions in their own arena. But Mr Leitch proved himself to be no mean antagonist, and in most instances came off best in the encounter. His noble zeal for truth is fittingly accompanied by a singular skill in detecting error. He is thus specially qualified to criticise critics, and to point out the mistakes of advocates. If his animadversions occasionally appear somewhat overstrained or hypercritical, they always proceed from a disinterested love of truth, and the strong apprehension of philosophical principle. A writer like Mr Leitch, who has in a manner made a field for himself, is much needed in these days of crude thinking and hasty writing, when even grave philosophers unwittingly make serious mistakes, and champions who profess to do battle for the truth sometimes give an important advantage to the adversary.

The work before us is perhaps the most ambitious performance Mr Leitch has yet given to the world. The first part, it is true, consists of the former work on "Christian Errors," carefully revised and retouched; but the second, and perhaps the more important part, consisting largely of a vindication of the opinions and principles propounded and applied in part first, is entirely new. Those who have read "Christian Errors Infidel

Arguments," will remember that certain important questions are there discussed in seven different dialogues, the interlocutors being Origen, a believer, Celsus, an unbeliever, and an umpire under the name of Theologus. We have never been very partial to the dialogue form of discussion. Even in the hands of Plato it is not always the most interesting or effective way of eliminating truth and exposing error. And we are bound to say that Mr Leitch displays no peculiar genius for dialogue. Though seldom deficient in philosophic, he seldom shines in dramatic power. His interlocutors occasionally get wooden in his hands, not speaking like living men, but serving as mere pegs to hang thoughts upon. This, however, is a matter of comparatively small importance. The current of discussion in the dialogues is always properly sustained, and the results are often of great interest and value.

The following are the chief points discussed in these dialogues :—there is always, and in every matter, an irreconcilable antagonism between truth and error; there is, or should be, a constant and invariable dependence of belief or faith upon knowledge; man must be held responsible for all his beliefs, and not merely for some of them; the distinction between a mystery and a contradiction, so important in many respects, should never be lost sight of; the difference between practical and speculative knowledge, and the difference between certainties and improbabilities, should be distinctly apprehended and consistently acted on; there is a criterion of morality independently of the Bible, else those ignorant of the Bible are not accountable beings; that criterion, so important and so necessary, is, with due pains, to be discovered.

Mr Leitch, with great power, and often great subtlety of argument, affirms and defends all these propositions. In a brief notice of this kind we cannot give any proper account of his manner of treating subjects of such interest and importance, or venture to challenge the propriety or validity of any point of his lengthened argumentations. He is a man whom the reader may sometimes disagree with, but whom he will find it very difficult to confute. Even when we think him wrong, it is almost impossible to convict him of error. He has an extraordinary confidence not only in truth, but in man's ability, with due diligence and honesty, to discover truth. He seems to think that all reasonable men, were they only to try, would certainly apprehend and appreciate properly the evidences and foundations of natural and revealed religion. With him error is always man's fault, and not his misfortune. It follows from his principles that all men of average intellectual and moral powers may arrive at the same conclusions not only in regard to the divine origin of the Bible, but in regard to all its contents. Hence, under the application of his principle, and through the realisation of his views, men will be at one in religion, there will be an undivided church, and controversy itself will disappear. Given a Bible, an intellect and a conscience, only one result should emerge, one series of doctrines should be adopted, one faith maintained. This may appear Utopianism, or a far distant Optimism to many. Even the most decided and accomplished Christians may smile incredulous when they hear of such views and expectations. But it is well that a man like Mr Leitch should take the field at this moment, and proclaim, in his own way, that truth is one, and that all her followers, who ought to be all men, may, and should, be of one mind. We think that he makes too little allowance for what we may be allowed to call the inevitable infirmities of human nature, and that he need never expect to see mathematical rigour and precision exemplified universally or even generally in moral reasoning or religious investigation. The finest intellect is, after all, but a prism more or less coloured; and when moral or religious questions are concerned, the infirmities of the flesh, the prepossessions of the mind, *will* appear. How seldom can Mr Leitch's ideal of inquiry and investigation be realised.

Men will surely cease to be fallen and fallible men when they all sit down honestly to the solution of the same great moral and religious problems, and all arrive at the same conclusions. Yet, let the ideal of a search after philosophical and religious truth be persistently held up to the world, and especially to Christendom, by philosophers like Mr Leitch, who nobly trust in truth, and believe that she is discoverable by all reasonable men, who act reasonably.

We have hardly room even to characterise the original portion of this volume, which is mainly devoted to a discussion of the great question, What is the criterion in morals? We think it remarkably able, and on the whole, successful as an argument; a valuable contribution to ethical science. We commend it, therefore, to the best attention of theologians and philosophers of every class, of all, in short, who can appreciate the philosophic discussion of great questions bearing directly upon morality and religion. We can also speak highly of Mr Leitch's style. It is an admirably clear and correct medium of his thoughts; elegant and spirited; not without ornament and graceful allusion, and well sustained in its strength and smoothness. Such a clear and acute thinker cannot fail to express himself with power and perspicuity.

The Doctrine of the Atonement, as Taught by Christ Himself; or, The Sayings of Jesus on the Atonement Exegetically Expounded and Classified. By REV. GEORGE SMEATON, Professor of Exegetical Theology, New College, Edinburgh. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1868.

We attach very great value to this seasonable and scholarly production. The *idea* of the work is most happy, and the *execution* of it is worthy of the idea. Over against that very indefinite and elastic thing called the "Christian consciousness," as a standard or gage of the doctrine of the Atonement, Professor Smeaton places Christ's own consciousness, as revealed by his own immediate personal utterances in the Gospels; and from these, on a scheme of truly Baconian exegetical induction, he presents us with a complete view of the various positions or propositions which a full and sound doctrine of the Atonement embraces.

A volume devoted to the discussion of this great doctrine, from this particular point of view, ought surely to be at the present day very acceptable. There are a great number of earnest minds at present to whom systematic theology presents the aspect of a dry, frigid, starched, and mummy-like object of contemplation; and hence a true, if formal, dogmatic has not the same probability of commending itself to them, as a false and arbitrary scheme of thought, provided it have an aspect of freshness and liveliness about it, which they think Puritanical orthodoxy incapable of assuming. Now this volume seems to meet the case of such, provided only they are earnest and honest. It is Biblical and exegetical. It appeals directly to Scripture, and it confines the discussion to a department of Scripture which those who dislike cut and dry systems of doctrine are peculiarly fond of. As for them, they have little favour for the doctrinal parts of the Epistles; and views of the Atonement derived from *them*, they set aside, to a great extent, on the ground that the style and cast of thought is Pauline,—“Pauline” being with them a very elastic adjective, and coming ultimately to mean, in such connections, “*something which ought not to be any further attended to.*” As for them, they wish to be allowed to study Christianity as it appears in the four Gospels, with their simplicity, freshness, and directness of historical incident, and their natural and unforced utterances of spiritual truth. Whether they are altogether wise in this is another matter; but in this volume they ought at least to admit

that they are dealt with according to their own wish. In all the forty-eight sections of which the work consists, there is not a single view given of the death of our Lord that is not educed from some expression of his own concerning it. And when we think that the very object of our Lord's living on earth at all, was that he might die,—that that object was continually present to his consciousness; that he was a sin-bearer not only in his last moments, and *in articulo mortis*, but a sin-bearer all his life long, and in every action he performed, and in every word he uttered,—we may well expect to find, in his various utterances, intimations of the meaning, nature, intention, and effect of his death as an atonement for sin, and as the culminating of a sin-bearing life, sufficient to present us, if not with a formal, at least with the materials for a very full view of the doctrine of his death as the surety and substitute for sinners.

It is a fundamental want, and becomes a positive *penitus ψυδος* in the schemes of those who are at present opposing the catholic evangelical doctrine of Atonement, that they never view the death of Christ as a voluntary act of his own, but merely as an *endurance* to which he willingly submitted. If they would only face, though as a mere hypothesis, the idea of Christ having died actively, "obedient unto death," they would be in circumstances to come to some competent decision on the truth or falseness of the orthodox doctrine. For if Christ died in the discharge of an official duty; if his death not merely occurred in the path of duty, but was itself the actual discharge of a duty, then his official act and his official position force on an examination into the nature of the office which he fulfils, or is said to fulfil; the relation in which he stands to him who appointed him, and to whom, of course, he is responsible; the terms of his appointment, and its period; the scope and design of the office in its general character and specific bearings; the other duties, besides that of dying at Calvary, which the office may involve; the satisfaction, or gratification, to speak reverently, which his discharge of it may have yielded, and may be for ever yielding, to him to whom he is responsible; and indeed a whole host of topics which in this line of thought inevitably present themselves. In short, they would find themselves shut up,—by every principle applicable, in any case, to the consideration of the history and circumstances of any official act or duty,—to find, and, finding, to frame, some such code of truths as evangelical divines are accustomed to denominate "the covenant of grace." We are by no means tied to a phrase. Give us a better, and we will not cling to this one. Give us any serviceable designation for what we are manifestly compelled in some form to express, and we have no such theological prudery as would din into the ears of hyper-sensitive people the old Puritan phraseology. We know Foster's "Essay on the aversion of men of taste to evangelical religion," and we remember the large (the somewhat too large) place which, in accounting for that aversion, he assigns to the use of peculiar language. And if the realities of divine truth are conserved, we do not insist on our own forms of expressing them. What we contend for is, that some such expression as the "covenant of grace" is needed to indicate the result of such investigations as must be prosecuted the moment we entertain the idea that Christ's death was an act which he accomplished in the fulfilment of official duty. Take this as, at first, a mere hypothesis, and, in the light of it, let a truly Baconian induction of the import of Christ's own sayings concerning his death be carried out, and what we affirm is that, on the analogy of all modern legitimate scientific investigation, the result of unforced Biblical and exegetical examination will be, that we must arrive at substantially the doctrine of the covenant of grace, or of the federal theology, with Christ's death as the seal of the covenant, and in a real and valid sense, the price of our forgiveness and of all our spiritual blessings.

This is what Professor Smeaton's work enables us to do. It does not

build up a system ; it gives us materials to build with. By rare insight into trains of thought ; by minutely accurate exegesis ; by severely legitimate method, always amenable to rule, and always guarding against the capricious and the arbitrary, never straining to educe or support a foregone conclusion ; by taking out of the text what is in it, never tempted to take more,—this very able theologian has presented us with an amount of truth on the doctrine of the Atonement, directly from the lips of the Great Deliverer himself, which has positively startled us by its amount, and delighted us by its consistency and its completeness.

We should have been glad to give several specimens of the author's method of investigation, but the limits of a brief notice of this description forbid. Let two passages suffice ; the one bringing out so beautifully the import of the *must* in the memorable assertion, "As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, so *must* the Son of Man be lifted up ;" the other, on substantially the same topic, "*the necessity of satisfaction to divine justice*," extracted from a most valuable essay in the appendix :—

"The *must* here expressed, bringing out what is indispensable, is not to be limited to the mere carrying out of the type, but has a deeper ground in God's purpose of redemption, and in order to finish the curse. That the punishment of sin must be borne and exhausted on the cross, was already indicated centuries before by the brazen serpent raised upon the pole. Plainly, the necessity here alluded to is a deep, inner necessity. It is not due merely to the fact that it was foreshadowed ; rather it was foreshadowed because it must needs take place on moral grounds. Though the faithfulness of God must be maintained in carrying out the types and prophecies, it was not they that conditioned the crucifixion, but conversely the deep necessity in the moral government of God that threw back its shadow upon them. As the punitive justice of God, or the necessity for the atonement, with the evidence that goes to establish it in our Lord's teaching, has been noticed in a previous section of this volume, we forbear to adduce the evidence which goes to illustrate it. Let it suffice to say, that the *must* here uttered by our Lord is connected with the communication of divine life and perfect healing, and that "no cross, no healing" is the purport of this testimony. When sin entered into the world, God's moral perfections rendered it indispensably necessary that it should receive its recompense of reward, and that a satisfaction for sin should be required before divine life could be diffused through the race. The Most High owes this to himself, it being a *must* in the divine government as well as a necessary provision for the relief of mental anxiety and dread. He owes this to himself, because he loveth righteousness (Ps. xi. 7). It was not brought about to make a mere impression on the moral universe, in order to deter them from sin ; and as little was it done because God was acting before a vast public, composed of all spiritual intelligences. The necessity of punishment, and of expiation, is irrespective of any aims or considerations that refer to a public apart from himself. His perfections are the only public before which he acts ; and he punishes sin only because of the demerit of it, as calling for punishment, and because he is under obligation to himself, or, in other words, from love to his rectitude, which is just love to himself (Ps. xi. 7). This punitive retribution is commonly called vengeance ; and the Most High claims it as his own prerogative : "Vengeance is mine : I will repay" (Rom. xii. 19 ; Deut. xxxii. 35). Hence, when moral evil has been committed, natural evil, suited to it, must needs ensue ; and we may lay down with confidence the position, that the creatures of God, in the moral government of God's world, suffer only what is due, and never more than their due. Hence, to bear this infliction in a manner which should expiate the sin and exhaust the curse, was the reason of Christ's crucifixion, and gives the explanation of the *must* which he here expresses."—(Pp. 224–5.)

The other passage to which we ask attention,—and it is a most precious one,—has reference to the “middle” theory of Grotius, explaining the necessity of an atonement, on the ground, not of the intrinsic requirement of law and justice, but on the desirableness of providing a spectacle fitted to deter other intelligences from sin. On this theory Professor Smeaton comments with a wisdom which all who discuss or study the doctrine of this volume would do well to imitate, and with reasonings which we have long felt are quite unanswerable. They are put with great force in the following splendid passage, for which alone our author would be entitled to our very best thanks, as he certainly secures our grateful admiration:—

“Men began to speculate on the salutary effects of punishment, which was no longer regarded as an end and as a penal infliction, which must be because sin deserved it, and because God owed it to himself. It came to be spoken of as a means to an end; nay, some began to speak of suffering as, having a tendency to augment the happiness of the universe. This theory is but a half-way house, and makes insoluble difficulties. Punishment is thus regarded as an arbitrary device, and not as a necessary visitation for a crime, a wrong, or insult, which must be avenged by the divine Majesty. It did not render justice to the word, “Vengeance is mine: I will repay” (Deut. xxxii. 35). And the effect of this modified opinion was only to foster doubts and objections, and to lead men step by step to modify and to apologise for, and finally to abandon, punitive justice as an attribute unworthy of God, and unnecessary for the vindication of his honour. In a word, wherever punishment is represented as being inflicted merely before some other public, or for some end apart from God, we may say that the matter in dispute is really given up, and the fortress surrendered into the hands of the enemy. If we maintain with Michaelis and Seiler, sincerely attached though they were to the doctrine of Christ’s satisfaction, that the principal end of punishment is to furnish a spectacle to deter men from sin, this is very far from satisfactory as applied to the atonement of Christ. Such a principle may be applicable to the government of human states, though not universally and absolutely applied as a rule even there, but it cannot be applied to the divine government. On this theory, all the inflictions unknown to others, such as the anguish of conscience, and all the secret consequences of vice, considered as a retribution for sin, fall to the ground. But, above all, on this theory, what purpose will punishments serve in the future life? Who are to be deterred by them, if that is their intention? It will not satisfy any one to say with Michaelis: to deter other rational beings; nor can any maintain that the deterring punishment in this life always follows on the offence, or that it is uniformly in proportion to the offence.

“Nor will another explanation avail, that God punishes for the glory of his justice. This may have two senses: (1.) it may mean that God, as supreme ruler, punishes with a political and prophetic design to maintain the authority of his government and reverence among his subjects, an end which cannot be attained without severity; or (2.) it may mean that the exercise of punishment takes place to convince men that God will not be regarded as indulgent and tolerant of evil. But this is wholly insufficient; for the question still arises, Why does God wish to impress this sentiment, and how does it tend to the glorification of his perfection? We must go further, and affirm something more; for no opinion would glorify him if it does not harmonise with truth. And the only position that can be maintained in reference to punishment is, that punitive justice is an essential, eternal, necessary attribute of God, and that its exercise is necessary on the entrance of sin; that God is such a person that, out of love to himself, and delight in himself, he loves all that coincides with his perfections, and hates all that is in collision with them; that his love leads him to bestow happiness, and his hatred or anger leads him to send the reverse. The

supreme God, insulted by sin, and at least wronged, if not personally injured, by the irreverence of free creatures, punishes to satisfy the perfection of his nature. This is the reason why he punishes; and no other explanation is satisfactory to any mind. And hence due consideration must be given to proper punishment, to vengeance, and retribution for ill-desert." — (Pp. 380-1.)

To whom shall we liken a theologian that can thus search and ground on principles beyond which the most enlightened spiritual reason and conscience feel instinctively that they neither can nor need to search deeper? We shall liken him to a wise man who built his house upon a rock. No theory that grounds the necessity of the atonement on *means to an end* can ever ground upon a rock or give repose. The search is not ended; the difficulty perpetually returns. But the search is ended, the difficulty cannot reappear, if the noble principles of the above truly scientific theology be admitted. There is real repose for the most acute intellect and the most sensitive conscience here; and the highest scientific intelligence seeking satisfaction to the reason, and the most profound sense of sin seeking peace to the conscience, may well blend the acknowledgments of their contentment in the cry which no restless theology, any more than a restless conscience, can adopt, "Return unto thy rest, O my soul; for the Lord hath dealt bountifully with thee."

May this volume have a long career of honoured usefulness, and be followed in due time by its proposed companion work, tracing the doctrine in the same manner through the remainder of the New Testament. *μ*

The Fatherhood of God, and its Relation to the Person and Work of Christ, and the Operations of the Holy Spirit. By CHARLES H. H. WRIGHT, M.A. of Trinity College Dublin, and Exeter College, Oxford, British Chaplain at Dresden. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1867.

The importance of this work may be inferred from the following account of its design given in the preface:—"The question of the Fatherhood of God is one closely connected with several of the controversies of the present day. The Cunningham Lectures of Principal Candlish, of the New College, Edinburgh, and the reply of Professor Crawford of the University of Edinburgh, have brought the subject before the general religious public. Viewed superficially, the discussion might be regarded as a logomachy. For even those who most strenuously oppose the doctrine of the Universal Fatherhood of God, in the sense in which divines of the Alexandrian School use the expression, admit that God may be justly styled the Father of all, if by that expression be only understood that he is the Creator, Teacher, and Preserver of mankind,—a sense which might even be justified by the usage of the Old Testament Scriptures. But the New Testament use of the term, Father and Son, when applied respectively to God and man, is more definite than that of the Hebrew Scriptures, and points to a much closer and more endearing connection than any which can exist between the creature and the Creator, regarded simply as such. When theologians of the new school speak of God's universal Fatherhood, they also comprehend under that expression several notions which evangelical divines consider to be in opposition to the teachings of Holy Writ. The differences between the two rival schools, on the questions under discussion, are not merely verbal. The modern disciples of Origen seem to teach that God, as the Universal Father, will deal with mankind generally, if not universally, as a tender and compassionate father would deal with his children here. On the other hand, evangelical theologians maintain that God's justice must be satisfied, as well as his love displayed; that it is only at the cross of Christ, the God-man, that mercy and truth meet together, and that no one is saved but by an act of free and undeserved grace."

From this extract it will appear that Mr Wright deals mainly with the Mauricean school. His treatise, however, takes up the question of baptismal regeneration, the sonship of believers, and various hermeneutical questions. Without subscribing to every sentiment expressed, we hail this volume as a valuable contribution to evangelical theology, and a seasonable correction to the vague, sensational, and semi-pagan theories of the day.

Christianity and Modern Progress. By the Rev. ALEXANDER RALEIGH, D.D., author of "Quiet Resting Places," &c. London: Jackson, Walford, & Hodder, 27 Paternoster Row. 1868.

This is an address which was delivered from the chair of the Congregational Union of England and Wales, at its annual meeting, on May 12. 1868. Natural knowledge and revealed religion must ever be in harmony, since both originate in God; and yet practically there has been always, and, in the present day especially, there is a wide-spread belief that there is an antagonism between them. To help to conciliate and harmonise science and revealed religion is the object of the author in this address, and with this view he dwells especially upon two points of agreement between them. The first is, that both are grounded upon a basis of unchangeable fact. There are facts in natural science so completely established that they are never disputed. There are also facts which stand at the heart of Christianity,—the birth, labours, miracles, sufferings, death, and resurrection of Christ,—that are amongst the most indisputable of historical verities; facts which, being proved, all substantially is proved. The author carefully marks a distinction between the facts of science and the inferences drawn from them,—a most important distinction, for scientific men sometimes falaciously mix them up together, and, contrary to the first principles of inductive philosophy, present them thus combined, as if they constituted ascertained science. Another important point of agreement between revealed religion and natural knowledge is that each is a system of laws. There is law in the moral and spiritual world as well as in the physical. Evangelical religion is a grand system of law. The great central doctrine of Christianity, the living sacrifice of Christ, by which atonement was made for sin, originated in the supreme regard of God for moral law, and it revealed, magnified, honoured, and established that law.

Such is a glance at the line of thought which the author works out in this admirable address. The subject is very seasonable, and it is treated with a closeness of argumentation, and a vigorous and manly eloquence, that fix the attention and are calculated to remove the doubts and to settle the convictions of the candid inquirer.

The passage in the address in which the author admits "that there are errors and mistakes in the Bible" has been strongly animadverted on by Dr W. L. Alexander, whose criticisms, in his letter to the *English Independent*, are entitled to the respectful consideration of the author. It would much improve the address were the whole of that passage reconstructed on the principle of conceding less to those who, to reduce the Bible to the level of a mere human authority, are constantly impugning its scientific, textual, chronological, or historical accuracy.

The Works of George Swinnock, M.A. Vols. I. and II., containing the Christian Man's Calling. Edinburgh: James Nichol. London: James Nisbet & Co. Dublin: G. Herbert. 1868.

George Swinnock, the author of these two volumes, was vicar of Great Kimbel, Bucks; and he was one of that noble army of confessors, who, after the restoration of Charles II., were ejected in 1662 for nonconformity.

Though less known than many of the other Puritan divines, he was a man of unquestionable ability, learning, and genius; and these two volumes, which may be said to form a system of Christian ethics, are valuable contributions to the series of the Puritan divines. Swinnock has thoroughly studied his subjects. The Scriptures are of course most frequently quoted as being his supreme authority; but numerous happy illustrations are skillfully appropriated from the Greek and Roman classics, the Christian fathers, and the writers of the Reformation. Here we have a storehouse of strong good sense and vigorous practical thinking in reference to the everyday duties of the Christian's life. In style, the author is sententious, and his sentences are constantly enlivened by quaint antithesis and comparisons, which are often striking, seldom incongruous, or such as would offend the taste even of a fastidious reader, reminding us at times of the style and genius of Shakspeare. The ministers of the church in the present day possess a great advantage over their predecessors, in the ease with which the works of these stalwart Puritans may now be obtained, and they are much indebted to the publisher of this series for having opened up to them, at so small a cost, this California—those rich theological mines from which they may derive much intellectual heavenly treasure, the acquisition of which must tell favourably on themselves and on their congregations. A Life of the author is promised when the publication of his works is completed.

The Pastor and his People : Discussions on Ministerial Life and Character.
By the Rev. A. F. DOUGLAS. London : James Nisbet & Co., 21 Berners Street. 1868.

These discussions relate to topics, "upon which," as the author remarks, "the ordinary working pastor will be compelled to think; problems which he will be under the necessity of solving for the guidance of his official life." They have been written chiefly for the theological student and the younger ministers of the church. The author modestly disclaims all intention of discoursing *ex cathedra* concerning the requirements of the Christian ministry; and in no part of his work does he ever assume the tone of authority or of superior wisdom. He simply exhibits the conclusions to which, from experience and observation, he has arrived, in the hope that they may in some measure benefit his fellow-labourers in the vineyard of Christ. The Christian ministry is a theme, which, of course, embraces a field so extensive that Mr Douglas's work must necessarily omit much which it is important for a minister of the gospel to know; but in the selection of his subjects he has shewn a wise discrimination; and we are certain that the theological student and younger minister, who seriously peruses and ponders the lessons in this volume, touching on many delicate points, will be preserved from many mistakes into which, from immaturity of experience, he might otherwise fall, to the sad detriment both of his usefulness and comfort. The author is a sagacious observer, and his knowledge of men and things he has turned to profitable account. Every chapter embodies much practical wisdom, expressed with a business-like force and directness better suited we think to the subject, and more effective, than if the author had written with elaborate embellishment, which he has purposely avoided. We cordially recommend this work as a valuable contribution to the literature of pastoral theology.

The Philosophy of Evangelism. Second edition. London : Elliot Stock, Paternoster Row. 1867.

In his preface to this work, the anonymous author observes, "It has been too readily taken for granted, that the peculiarities of the evangelical

system are out of harmony with natural religion. We believe the reverse to be the case." "Placed between two extremes, with neither of which we can entirely sympathise, there is some danger of our sharing the not unusual fate of men of no party. Strict dogmatists, whether so on conviction, or because bound by subscription to ecclesiastical formulas, are apt to turn away with repugnance from a method of investigation which partakes of the nature of free inquiry. And the lovers of free inquiry are not generally disposed to look with complacency on those who maintain evangelical opinions. Hence it is not improbable that we shall be repudiated for both, without either of them taking the trouble to look through our pages with sufficient care to enable them to give reasons for their judgment." Some idea of the drift of the author may be gathered from the concluding paragraph of the book:—"The chief thing we fear from critics is, lest undue attention be given to the mere incidents of the discussion, instead of striking home at once to its innermost principles. That principle we here again record. It is brief. It is simply that all true and saving faith in the Christian atonement is intuitional. More at large it is as follows, viz., humanity is constituted so as to implicate us not only in our own person moral acts, but also in the moral acts of each other; and, *in consequence thereof*, considered in its higher exercises, extends beyond the sphere of our individual conduct, and is sympathetically affected by others' conduct. The extension of these principles to their utmost degree unfolds the true theory of the sufferings of Christ for our guilt, and of our participation in His perfect righteousness. By virtue of His UNION with us in *moral consciousness*, a clear avenue is opened between the Christ consciousness and the human consciousness, and we detect in their inter-communion the accord of the atoning act and the believing act. Our Saviour, conscious of our sins, has taken them upon himself, and atoned for them; we, conscious of his righteousness, appear with it in the sight of God and are justified; our sins are his sins; his righteousness our righteousness; and *this union of Christ and his people in moral consciousness, is the CENTRAL IDEA OF THE GOSPEL.*"

We are not quite sure if we understand what the author means by strict dogmatists, whether so from conviction, or because bound by subscription to ecclesiastical formulas. If he means persons who, after due study of the word of God, entertain and profess conscientious convictions of divine truth, in other words, who are attached to a settled form of religious belief, we take leave to say first, that we are not ashamed to rank ourselves amongst such dogmatists; secondly, that we deny the right of any one to stigmatise this as an "extreme"; and, thirdly, that we see no reason why we, holding our present sentiments with all firmness until convinced of their untenableness, should be regarded as apt to turn away with repugnance from a method of investigation which partakes of the nature of free inquiry. It is high time that this ridiculous assumption, that "free inquiry" is incompatible with settled religious convictions should be put down as alike unfounded in fact, and as an insult to the great mass of professing Christians. We regret that the author of this interesting treatise should have thought it necessary to adopt the cant of the day, by proclaiming himself at the outset as "a man of no party." We regret it the more, inasmuch as by undertaking to shew the philosophy of evangelism he places himself in reality on the very ground which we occupy. we might say to him, away with such pretensions to a freedom of inquiry unknown to the rest of thy brethren; leave it to essayists and reviewers, who have no settled religious belief, to glory in ignoring all the truths which thou holdest in reverence. Thou art a believer in evangelism, and thy speech betrayeth thee.

Were we disposed to be over critical, we might have charged our author with a disposition to claim an originality, or rather singularity, for his views which they do not really possess. Few preachers, who have made the gospel the subject of earnest and (we say not independent, for that term has been sadly abused, but) personal investigation, can have failed to discover and trace out in their own way the philosophy of evangelism. Bishop Butler, if duly studied, will help many in this task, which, after all, is very much the style of modern sermonising. Still, however, we hail the present volume as a valuable contribution to the cause of evangelical discussion. Without pledging ourselves to the approval of all its modes of statement, we like its spirit, and think that the author has often happily succeeded in fulfilling its design. We have been frequently struck with the power displayed in bringing out the philosophical aspects of Christianity. The student of theology will be the better of perusing it; and for the soundness of its philosophy he may feel assured, when we state that it rests on such authorities as Dr Abercrombie and Dr M'Cosh.

Gatherings from a Ministry. By the Rev. JOHN MILNE, Perth. London: James Nisbet & Co., Berners Street. 1868.

This volume affords a favourable specimen of the diligence and ability with which the author discharges the most important part of the duties of the pastoral function,—that of preaching the gospel. To those who are under his ministry it will have a special interest, and it may be read with pleasure and profit by a wider circle. The matter of the discourses is rather subjective than objective, bearing largely on the believer's exercise and experience; but whatever relates to Christian life and godliness is made to rest upon sound evangelical principles. The style is very perspicuous, and yet attractive, from its simple elegance; beautiful and stirring thoughts often arrest the attention; the tone and manner are earnest and impressive; and, from their whole scope, these "Gatherings from a Ministry" are well adapted for Christian edification.

From Seventeen to Thirty. The Town Life of a Youth from the Country: its Trials, Temptations, and Advantages. Lessons from the History of Joseph. By T. BINNEY. London: James Nisbet & Co., 21 Berners Street. 1868.

This little volume, which is an expansion of a lecture delivered in Exeter Hall, on the 29th of January 1867, to the London Young Men's Christian Association, is on a subject profoundly important to young men, connected as it is with their best interests both in this world and in the world to come. As was to be anticipated from an author who has taught the young before the lessons for making the best of both worlds, he fully sympathises with the aspirations of young men after success in business, whilst reminding them that this is not to be sought at whatever price, nor to be made the principal end of life. His leading object is to give them wholesome advice as to the best means by which right and honourable success in the world can be achieved; to teach them by one of the most singular examples recorded in history, that of Joseph, that this can be done only by the cultivation of pure and lofty Christian principles and habits, of true self-respect and self-control, sustained by faith in God, and that secular virtue is not sufficient, but ought to have a basis in genuine religion, in a filial trust and a holy fear of God. Yet he does not encourage the young, even when they follow the counsels given in this lecture, to gild the future with too brilliant colours—to form too high expectations of worldly success, which, in many instances, would certainly not be realised. "I wish you," says he, "clearly

to understand, that it is not taught, and it is not to be supposed, either that any of you that likes may, in all respects, become a Joseph or a Cobden, or that you are all to make success, rise, distinction, the one great object of desire and pursuit. All you young men cannot become principals, capitalists, heads of firms, owners of property, or holders of positions sufficient to entitle you to a sheriff's gold chain, or the Lord Mayor's gilt coach. If prosperity come, welcome it, and be thankful; but don't think that the great end of life cannot be attained without it. Especially, don't start with the determination that it *shall* be achieved at whatever cost. The grand thing to be kept in view is the cultivation of those principles and habits, that course and character, out of which success, if it come at all, may come according to the will of God. It will then be in itself a blessing, and will bring one."

This is a volume which ought to be read by every young man, and especially by every young man on quitting his father's house to enter a large city to prosecute, in the midst of many perils and temptations, and, it may be discouragements, the business of life. It is the utterance of the gathered and matured wisdom of a long and shrewd observer—of a master in Israel; and we hope that it will largely accomplish the good for which it was prepared and is now published.

In Memory of James Hamilton, D.D., the beloved Minister of the Presbyterian Church, Regent Square. Died November 24th 1867.

This volume, to the memory of the late Dr James Hamilton, will be welcomed by all who appreciate his writings, and especially by the members of the congregation who enjoyed the inestimable advantages of his pastoral superintendence and instructions. It commences with a very impressive account of the circumstances connected with his last illness, death, and funeral. The introductory narrative is followed by the sermons preached by the Rev. Dr Candlish and the Rev. Henry Allon in the Presbyterian Church, Regent Square, London, on the Sabbath after his funeral. Other tributes paid to his memory are added, consisting of sermons, extracts from sermons and addresses, delivered by various ministers of the Church of England, and of the Independent and United Presbyterian Churches, on the occasion of his death. We are glad to know that a uniform edition of his works is in preparation by the publishers of this Periodical, and that edition ought, we think, to be accompanied with a memoir of his life. His collected works will form the most enduring monument to his memory, and will, we doubt not, be eminently useful to the Church of Christ.

Apologetic Lectures on the Saving Truths of Christianity. Delivered in Leipsic in the Winter of 1866. By CHR. ERNST LUTHARDT, Doctor and Professor of Theology. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street, 1868.

Dr Luthardt is an earnest labourer on the side of Evangelical truth in Germany. His lectures on the Gospel of John and on the Fundamental Truths of Christianity have already established his reputation as an able, learned, and sound theologian. The present lectures are not inferior in any of the qualities which have acquired for his previous works the warmest commendations and an extensive circulation. They embrace: The Nature of Christianity, Sin, Grace, the God-Man, the Work of Jesus Christ, the Conclusion of the Work of Redemption and the Trinity, the Church, Holy Scripture, the Church's Means of Grace, and the Last Things. They thus traverse a wide field of theological inquiry, in which there is ample scope for the most interesting and profitable discussion; and touching on themes respecting which the minds of many in the present day need to be en-

lightened and established, they are in every sense lectures for the times. These varied subjects the author treats, not exhaustively, which was not his purpose; but the lectures are obviously the result of careful study and well-digested reading. Nor does he give them a controversial aspect by combating error formally; but he meets it more effectively by an eloquent and powerful exposition of the truth. Whilst the author walks in the old trodden paths, there is, along with a remarkable clearness of apprehension and accuracy of judgment, a freshness and originality of thought, and a singular beauty of language, under the spell of which we read these lectures with unflagging interest. We learn with great satisfaction that, when delivered at Leipsic, they attracted unusual and sustained interest; and in their published form, in German and in English, we hope that, by the blessing of God, they will be more extensively useful, both in Germany and in England, in counteracting rationalism, and in procuring for evangelical truth a welcome reception into many minds.

The Word. The Star out of Jacob. By the author of *Dollars and Cents*. London: James Nisbet & Co., 21 Berners Street. 1868.

In this book every thing is told in a very pleasing and lively manner. It is especially well adapted for household instruction, and it may also be very useful to teachers, by suggesting many topics fitted to excite the curiosity, and gain the attention of the young.

The Work of God in Every Age. By the Rev. W. FROGGATT. London: Jackson, Walford, and Hodder, 27, Paternoster Row. 1867.

The conception of the "History of the Work of Redemption," by Jonathan Edwards has always struck us as an evidence of the transcendent intellectual grasp of that eminent theologian. The fundamental idea of that work, which is to shew how the most remarkable events in all past ages have been, and in all coming ages to the close of time will be, rendered subservient to the accomplishment of the redemption of man, by which is meant, not only Christ's obedience, sufferings, and death on earth, but everything preparatory thereto, and following thereupon, the erection and preservation of the Church, the overthrow of the power of Satan, and the actual salvation of individual sinners—this is one of the most magnificent and sublime conceptions that can enter the mind of man or angel. To carry it out is to write the history of Paradise regained. It exhibits the unity and grandeur of God's plan respecting our world, it harmonises the events of Providence which appear most discordant, and it connects them with a scheme of infinite wisdom and mercy.

Mr Froggatt does not propose a plan so extensive and imposing as that of President Edwards, but his object is to unfold a most important part of it—the work of God, in all ages, in the restoration of individual men to his favour and image—in giving them just conceptions and holy affections in reference to himself, as their Creator, Sovereign, and Redeemer—in bringing them, as sinful, lost creatures, to genuine repentance and to true faith in Christ as their only Saviour. This subject, which ought to be deeply interesting to Christians at all times, Mr Froggatt has treated in a manner worthy of all commendation. He is wholly free from the extravagant or extreme views which have often done much to bring discredit on the cause of revivals of religion. His theology is that of the old Puritan school, and his soundness of judgment and earnestness of purpose are ever apparent. The field which he traverses is wide, extending from the fall of man to the present time; and his illustrations he derives from every part of the world where the gospel of Christ has been preached.

BRITISH AND FOREIGN EVANGELICAL REVIEW.

OCTOBER 1868.

ART. I.—*The Swedish Reformation.*

Svenska Kyrkoreformationens Historia. I tre afdelningar. Af L. A. ANJOU. Upsala, 1850. (History of the Reformation in Sweden. In three divisions. By L. A. Anjou. Upsala, 1850.)

WE resume the story of the Swedish Reformation, with the purpose of bringing it down to the date of the Convocation of Upsala, when the triumph of the Protestant cause was finally achieved, and the liberties of the Church were settled on a sure and durable basis. At the conclusion of our last article, we left ecclesiastical affairs among the Swedes in a most confused and discordant state, the result of King John's insane attempt to force a semi-popish liturgy upon his unwilling subjects. Some, indeed, of the bishops and clergy had accommodated themselves to the sovereign's wishes, but a very large number were conscientiously opposed to the reception of the "Red Book," as John's new church-manual was ordinarily styled, and chose rather to submit to the severest penalties than adopt and employ the obnoxious missal. In this determination they were sedulously strengthened by the king's brother, Duke Charles, who was a firm supporter of Protestant principles, and opened up within his own territories a place of refuge for the clergy who were deposed from their charges on account of their refusal to obey King John's unjust commands. It was a time of great trial for the faithful portion of the

• See *British and Foreign Evangelical Review* for April of the present year.
VOL. XVII.—NO. LXVI. X X

Swedish pastors ; but it was also a time fraught with precious consequences for the future of the Protestant Church. To use the words of Bishop Anjou : "The severity with which the monarch endeavoured to compel the introduction of his prayer-book, was the testing fire which purified the Swedish Church to a clear conviction of the Protestant principles that formed its real groundwork." After the gloomy eclipse of trial, there broke forth the invigorating sunshine of a brighter and better day. Taught by persecution, and reaping salutary lessons from the furnace of adversity, the pastors and people of Sweden were led to see that in order to attain the establishment of reformed truth on a solid and substantial foundation, there must be henceforth no truce with Romish heresies and superstitions, but an unyielding resistance to all that savoured of the gross spiritual darkness out of which they had so recently emerged. And it was such a conviction that bore them victoriously onwards until they reached their goal, and, rescuing the cause of the Reformation from the numerous enemies who assailed it, were enabled to hand it down, in firmly consolidated shape, to their children and their children's children.

Gradually, during the liturgical conflict, the hopes of the Romish Church to regain supremacy in Sweden began to languish and decay. Without doubt, the violent efforts of King John to compel submission to his hated prayer-book had at first given these hopes a certain measure of vitality ; but the unconquerable opposition of the stricter Protestant party soon made it evident on what a slender foundation they reposed. Moreover, there were various other circumstances contemporaneously occurring, which tended to damp the expectations of the Court of Rome—notwithstanding that Gregory the XIII. seems, even still, to have cherished the idea of a possible reconciliation between the Swedish kingdom and the Papal See. At all events, that Pontiff wrote a letter to King John, in which he lauds his good intentions, and kindly finds excuses for the king's reluctance to comply with his requests, especially as regarded the Eucharist ; while he, at the same time, reminds him that, seeing he had no real priest in his dominions, it would be wise to appoint a Romish bishop, even were it in some remote spot of Finland or Norrland, in order that he might labour for the restoration of the Church. Gregory's missive was conveyed to the Swedish monarch by Possevin, the celebrated Jesuit, who already, in 1577, had visited Sweden, and laboured strenuously there on behalf of the lost Papal power. Shortly afterwards, the decease of Queen Catherine, which took place in 1583, dis severed the bond of connection whereby Rome first embraced the opportunity of making advances to her husband ; and as she had

spent the last years of her life under Jesuistic influence—an influence which, through her, extended also to the king—the Protestants trusted that, when she expired, the farther progress of the Church of Rome would likewise receive its death-blow. Of the two children of Catherine who survived their mother, one, the Princess Anna, was lost for the interests of Catholicism. It would seem, in fact, that the Romish missionaries made little effort to gain her over, knowing that she was not the inheritor of the throne. She was believed outwardly to follow her mother's faith; yet, according to King John's positive assertion, she had completely abjured, before Catherine's decease, the creed of the Church of Rome. Dalin, the Swedish historian, as quoted by Anjou, relates that Anna was present, unobserved, when the queen, before her departure, confessed to the Jesuit Warsevitz her dread of purgatory, and asked him if the sufferings she now endured would shorten in her case the torment of the intermediate state, to which Warsevitz replied, that there was *no purgatory at all*, but that the doctrine had been invented to hold in check the simple and the silly. The saying sunk deep into the mind of the princess, and from that moment she entertained an insufferable repugnance to the Romish faith; so that in Poland also, where she spent nearly thirty years of her life after 1598, she remained loyal to the Lutheran Confession. Her brother Sigismund, on the other hand, was devoted to the Church of Rome, and, as history emphatically tells us, was one of its most obedient sons, in post-Reformation days, among the princes and kings of Europe. In vain did his father and the counsel of the realm endeavour to modify his principles. Their representations that, by his devotion to Popery, he was hazarding his destined crown, only called forth the answer, that he valued not so highly an earthly diadem as to exchange for it a heavenly. He took part, nevertheless, in his father's liturgical worship; but the Romish mass was, in addition, repeatedly solemnized for his behoof, and Jesuits were always found in his companionship.

Such being the case, it was natural that the hopes of the Romish party, while depressed by present prospects, should anticipate with reviving confidence Prince Sigismund's accession to the throne. From his father they could now expect little or nothing that was decidedly favourable to their views. Not indeed that John shewed any disposition as yet to exchange his past policy for one more in accordance with the wishes of the great majority of his subjects. About a year and a half after Queen Catherine's decease, he had espoused Gunnila Bjelke, by training and inclination a Protestant; yet although his second marriage probably exercised upon him a certain influence, and, combined with other circumstances

contributed to estrange him somewhat from the Romish party, it had not the effect of bringing him into closer harmony with the Protestants. On the contrary,—and the fact is curious and suggestive, as indicating the strange mixture of eclecticism and narrow-mindedness, of mobility and obstinacy, that formed the king's abnormal character,—no sooner had he in part withdrawn from the Roman, than he made advances to the Eastern Church, and actually appointed Bishop Eric of Aabo to translate his liturgy into the Greek language, and thereafter to repair to Constantinople for the purpose of opening negotiations with the patriarch in that city. But, true to his wavering nature, John ere long gave up the project. Meanwhile, the chief endeavour of the Court of Rome was to save the future Swedish sovereign from the destructive snares of heresy. Just prior to his death, Gregory the Thirteenth addressed him in a letter, admonishing him to spiritual steadfastness. The new Pope, Sixtus V., followed the example of his predecessor, and corresponded for the same end with Sigismund. To strengthen him in his adherence to the Catholic creed, additional Jesuit missionaries were despatched to Sweden. They had been specially selected by Possevin; and the instructions he compiled for their guidance are of a truly characteristic kind. They were to keep secret their real profession and intentions, to conceal their books and dresses, and during their journey always to perform in private their devotions. Arrived at Stockholm, they were to introduce themselves to the king, and assure him of the Pontiff's good will. If they could not obtain an audience, they were to communicate to the king their errand in writing; but in all cases publicity must be avoided. Nothing, however, is known of their reception; yet it is indisputable that at a later period King John was so alienated from the Jesuits, that he warned in strong terms his son Sigismund against them. "They were the worst of priests," so ran the monarch's unflattering description, "accustomed to have one foot in the pulpit and another in the council-chamber, ready to work every evil, provided their own object was thereby attained. He could not without remorse and anger think of the sorrow they had caused him during the time they were in Sweden." Sigismund himself was eventually compelled to dismiss them, in order that he might obviate the suspicions he was otherwise certain to incur, as crown prince, on the part of the Swedish people. Such was the position of affairs when an event of no slight ecclesiastical importance occurred,—the vacancy in the see of Strengnäs, caused by the demise of Bishop Nils Olai in 1585. The incidents which followed this event, along with the election of Sigismund to the throne of Poland, "prepared as their ripened fruit,"—to employ the

appropriate words of Anjou,—“the decrees of the convocation of Upsala, the grand groundwork of the Swedish Church.”

Among the indefinite provisions of the will of King Gustavus I., was the question as to who should be the Church's protector and patron in the principalities that were allotted to his younger sons. “Was it,” as the matter is well put by Anjou, “the independent right of the sovereign to perform this duty, or had Gustavus contemplated the Church and the Church's government as simply and solely a separate phase of the State and its administration, and that, therefore, the right of the ducal princes should, in this respect, be similar to that which they otherwise exercised in the territories assigned to them?” But even if he had borrowed such a principle from the neighbouring Protestant States, it is impossible to suppose that he intended to hand over to his sons the power of either arbitrarily promulgating or abrogating the doctrine and worship which should be received or rejected by their subjects, as was not seldom the practice in some of the states of Germany. Gustavus had little anticipation, indeed, of the divisions which were already beginning to make their appearance in the ranks of Protestantism before he was taken to his rest; and if he believed that the kingly power and authority involved the possession of the right in ecclesiastical affairs which he had arrogated to himself since 1539, least of all could he suspect that such a right would ever be exerted for any other purpose than to preserve his own work in the establishment of the Reformation cause. Yet now, strange to say, things had gone so far, that the son who bore the sceptre of the Swedish realm, believed it to be his royal prerogative to make new ecclesiastical enactments, altogether independently of the ritual of the Church as finally settled and sanctioned in the later years of his father's reign,—while the son, again, who alone among his brothers retained the ducal dominions paternally bequeathed to him, considered it to be his princely privilege and duty to uphold, against the efforts of the king himself, his late royal father's work. The vacancy in the see of Strengnäs threatened to bring matters to an open rupture between the two. Duke Charles, dreading the appointment, by John, of some liturgist clergyman as the successor of Bishop Nils Olai, and also resolved to claim and exercise independent ecclesiastical authority within the limits of his own States, caused an election to be made, according to the regulations of 1571, and thereafter ratified the electors' choice. That choice fell upon Petrus Jonæ, formerly professor in Upsala, now pastor of Nyköping. Scarcely any individual in Sweden could have been more obnoxious to King John. Petrus Jonæ was an inflexible opponent of the liturgy,

and, on that very account, a fugitive from the monarch's vengeance to the territories of Charles, who gladly gave him shelter and protection ; and his elevation to the vacant see was therefore esteemed, and rightly so, an act of open defiance to John and his deeply-cherished prayer-book. The king's anger knew no bounds. He declared the election void, because it had occurred without his sanction, and was an attack upon his royal privileges ; nay, going further, he threatened his brother's subjects with outlawry if they approved of such a choice. The only effect of all this was to confirm the determination of Duke Charles, his clergy, and his people. No steps, doubtless, were taken towards the consecration of Petrus Jonæ, for the simple reason that it was impossible to do so while the bishops of the kingdom proper declined, like their sovereign, to recognise the validity of his election ; and he consequently did not remove to Strengnäs, but continued to reside at Nyköping, and to discharge the duties of his pastoral office there. Yet, from the moment that he assumed, as nominal bishop, his place at the head of the clergy of the dukedom, they willingly shared in all his conflicts and dangers, and, with one accord, supported him to the utmost of their power,—passing now from the stand-point of a mere negative resistance to that of positive attack upon their liturgical opponents. Of so marked a change in their tactics, the proceedings at the Synod of Oerebro, which met immediately afterwards, by command of Charles, afford a striking illustration. The assembled clergy declared themselves, in terms of unmistakeable significance, against the liturgy, and in favour of the observance of the older rites and customs of the Swedish Church,—an expression of their mind which did not fail to fan the flame of hostility that had already sprung to active life between the royal brothers. The procedure of Charles, in other respects, about the same time, was rife with even more serious results. Firmly resolved to establish, in every possible way, his position as supreme defender of the menaced Protestant faith in Sweden, he summoned to his aid the banished preacher Abraham (mentioned in our previous paper as a keen anti-liturgic champion), and enjoined him to repair to the universities of Leipzig, Wittemberg, and Helmstedt, with the view of obtaining their *written judgments* on the great bone of contention between the two parties—the half-loved, half-hated liturgy. Abraham faithfully fulfilled the duke's injunction, and procured replies from the theological faculty of each of these universities, and also from that of Frankfort on the Oder. They were conceived in a strongly Protestant spirit, and were, therefore, everything that Charles could wish. For example, besides distinctly condemning the "Red Book," Wittemberg remarks that, as the Jesuits had already

circulated the report that Sweden was about to be restored, through their means, to the bosom of the Romish Church, this was a sufficient reason to go forth from Babylon, and no longer halt between two opinions. Leipzig, again, compares the liturgy to a whitened sepulchre,—fair without, but inwardly filled with dead men's bones, and all uncleanness; and complains that it attributes the work of Satan to the Holy Spirit. Such theological manifestoes could not but be welcome to Duke Charles in his present circumstances, and their publication in Sweden was aptly calculated to increase the storm of mutual hostility. Nor was Abraham's own pen idle. He flung himself into the very midst of the controversial tempest, and issued a series of tractates, which, although often sadly deficient in gentleness and courtesy of language,* were strongly marked with the broad stamp of Protestantism, and did a world of good in still further awakening the feeling of the public against the king's semi-Popish missal. Almost at the same time, a daring and decisive step was taken by Duke Charles, which put the copestone on the work in which he had been engaged. A second meeting of the clergy of his states was called, which terminated in a formal condemnation of the liturgy, and a formal rejection of its use.

Just at this critical period, Prince Sigismund left Sweden for Poland, to ascend the throne left vacant by the death of Stephen Bathory in 1586. King John and his Council were careful, in such circumstances, to secure the liberties of the Swedes under their future ruler; and, for that purpose, in the very days when, on the invitation of Duke Charles, the clergy of his dominions were resolving, at Strengnäs, to repudiate the liturgy, the king and his council were, at Vadstena, framing the conditions designed to preserve the monarch's ecclesiastical constitution from the dreaded popery of Sigismund. For it must be remembered that, while John was obstinately attached to his own "Red Book," and all the half Romish rites and ceremonies therein prescribed, he was no less obstinately opposed to everything that savoured of a claim to the spiritual allegiance of his subjects on the part of the Supreme Pontiff. So the conditions were laid down, that Sigismund, whenever, during his father's life-time, he again visited Sweden, should not have

* He gives, *e.g.*, to the liturgy the title of "*Den Herbestialiska Possevinska*," a play upon the name of Herbst, Queen Catherine's Popish chaplain, who was supposed, although erroneously, to have had a hand in its compilation. "*Ljugenda sanctorum*" (*lies of the saints*), instead of "*Legenda sanctorum*," is perhaps more pardonable; but, on the whole, there is too much of this play upon words—sometimes coarse, and often frivolous—in the writings of Abraham. It was, however, the general blemish of the age, and, in that respect, he is little worse than his contemporaries.

more priests in his train than hitherto belonged to his household ; subsequently he should have only ten, and on no account should he permit them to interfere with schools and churches, or to insult the religion of the country. The Swedes who might follow him to Poland were there to enjoy religious freedom. The ecclesiastical usages and ceremonies that had been introduced and established under the reign of John, were to remain unchanged by his son and successor. (This was, of course, intended to give perennial existence to his dearly-beloved liturgy.) The Gregorian calendar was not to be adopted.* The incomes with which the archbishop, the bishops, and the clergy, had been invested by King John, were never to be resumed by his successors ; and thus for the first time, while these revenues were viewed in the light of a royal grant or fief, it was sought to secure them from any changes which might be contemplated by a Popish sovereign. But while the king, in this fashion, endeavoured to protect his present ecclesiastical fabric against the apprehended assaults of his own son, he took equal care to keep him from any undue subservience to the Roman See. It was stipulated that when, after his coronation, he addressed the Pope in the usual letter, he should not use the word *obedientia*, as unbecoming his royal dignity, but *obsequium*, which was susceptible of a weaker meaning. Neither was he to speak of "foot-kissing" (the wonted formula, *cum devota osculatione pedum*), because it would irritate the Swedish people, who, on account of his too great reverence for the Pope, might "dread the introduction of the Inquisition."

"If the king and father," says Amjou, "was agitated by such partly-frivolous, partly-momentous cares, we may easily fancy how great an alarm was occasioned among the Protestant Swedes by the duplication of his son's future power through the added sovereignty of Poland. In the very midst of that alarm appeared the already-mentioned rejection of the 'Red Book' by the clergy of Strengnäs diocese ; and Duke Charles despatched to his brother a copy of the same." John's wrath, as might be expected, was illimitable. Even the most wanton attempt to deface the lustre of his crown, would have less enraged him than this attack upon his cherished liturgy from the one side, while he was so busily employed in guarding it against all possible dangers from the other. He forthwith

* We need scarcely remind our readers, that the introduction of the improved calendar was, at this time, a somewhat important ecclesiastical question. It had been promulgated for the regulation of the Church's festivals, in the name of Pope Gregory XIII., in 1582, and, by his edict, introduced into the various Roman Catholic kingdoms,—which circumstance induced the Protestant State in general to repudiate it, lest, by its adoption, they might seem to show obedience to the Roman Pontiff.

hurled a frantic proclamation at the Strengnäs clergy, in which he exhausts the whole vocabulary of abuse. He styles them disloyal traitors, apostates, arch-liars, shameless slanderers, illiterate bunglers and blockheads, and every other nickname his fruitful fancy could invent. They ought to know, he says, that the word *offerimus* does not signify "we offer," but "we set forth" Christ, which is done in the heart by faith and prayer. They called the king and his advisers papists, but they themselves were "Satanists," because they followed the devil, the father of lies. They excused their conduct by pleading, that they "must obey God rather than man," thus employing the same argument as Nils Dacke, when he played the part of a traitor to King Gustavus. But since for years they had provoked his anger, he would no longer tolerate such "limbs of Beelzebub," and now he declared all the clergy of Södermanland, Nerike, Vermland, Vadsbo, and Valla *fredlösa* (outlaws); if any of them ventured beyond the principality, he was to be seized and kept in prison, until convinced of his error by the pure word of God. Their entire possessions in the kingdom proper were sequestrated. Every teacher and preacher among his own subjects, who shared their views, was to experience a similar fate.

Indulgence in controversial Billingsgate was a feature of the age; and where a dignified monarch stooped to set the example, he was certain to have followers. A lampoon,* containing the wildest attacks on Luther, the Reformation, and the clergy of Strengnäs, was circulated through the kingdom, and produced all the more powerful an effect, that its authorship was attributed to some of John's secretaries. It received, however, a triumphant answer from the pens of Petrus Jonæ and Martinus Olai, couched in calm and temperate language, which contrasted favourably with the congeries of stupid vituperation that had called it forth. The fatuous blow they had blindly dealt at Protestantism, recoiled upon the heads of the sovereign and his instruments.

While these events were transpiring in the Swedish kingdom, the clergy of the principality evinced no remissness in the preparation of defensive measures. At a meeting in Oerebro, they issued a manifesto, in the shape of a letter to the king, his council, and the Swedish bishops and pastors, conspicuous for the mild and courteous, yet at the same time, firm and unyielding, tone of its contents; and they also transmitted to John a Latin confession, in which they enumerated the reasons that kept them from the adoption of this prayer-book. For the

* This tractate was scandalously entitled, "A Letter from Satan, the king of deep hell, to his faithful servants, the bishop and priests of Norrland." It is rife with almost unadulterated Romanism.

time had now come when the Protestant Church of Sweden felt compelled to seek its safety in a religious formula of binding obligation ; and, therefore, the compilers of this document, in order that they might refute the charge of apostacy, expressly appealed to the Augsburg Confession of 1530, and Luther's Smaller Catechism (already translated into Swedish), as embodying the substance of the truth contained in the writings of the prophets and apostles. They deny, moreover, the accusation of treason ; what they had spoken and written against the liturgy, did not conflict with the duty they owed their sovereign ; for they could say with St Paul himself, that "the weapons of their warfare were not carnal, but mighty through God to the pulling down of strongholds, casting down imaginations, and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ." Further, they expressed their belief that the king had emitted his proclamation "in a mood of hasty anger," and they, therefore, strove to deprecate his hostility. Their concluding supplication was lost upon King John, who plainly saw from the whole tenor of the manifesto and confession, that their resolve to reject his prayer-book was immoveable. Besides, to his surprise and alarm, he now found that the clergy of his own territories were reluctant to sever ecclesiastical communion with their brethren of the principality, as he fondly hoped they would have done ; nay more, that a considerable number of them were even withdrawing their allegiance from that very "Red Book," which already, at his command, they had received. All things betokened, and betokened happily, the "beginning of the end." The monarch's continued threats and violence had at last aroused to full activity the true Protestant feeling of his subjects, both lay and clerical, and it was evident that ere long he must bow before the storm he had evoked. But to the pastors of the principality, in the first instance, appertains the credit of bringing about this desirable consummation.

Our space will only permit us to touch lightly on the closing incidents in the reign of John. The wearing-out ecclesiastical struggle in which he had been for years engaged, drove him ultimately to the adoption of a different course. "Harassed by continual cares, and by still greater apprehensions," says an English historian of Scandinavia, "the king saw that his sole hope of security lay in a cordial reconciliation with his brother. The price was a dear one,—a share in the government of the kingdom."* John actually went the length of inventing an excuse for the duke's behaviour during the litur-

* Dunham's "History of Denmark, Sweden, and Norway," Vol. III. p. 218.

gical conflict, because he had "neither himself written, nor allowed any one else to write, against the Red Book." Surely a strange and shallow apology; but state necessities required it to be made, and made it therefore was. Many of the clergy, both among the subjects of John and Charles, having expressed strong desires for an ecclesiastical convocation, and Charles himself having declared that, had a *free* Christian council been summoned at the commencement, all subsequent evils would have been completely obviated, it was one of the conditions laid down as the basis of reconciliation between the royal brothers, in 1590, that a synod should be assembled where every member would have a free voice; yet should no agreement be effected between the opposing clerical parties, neither side was to do violence to the conscience of the other, nor to exchange controversial and vituperative pamphlets, but to live in mutual concord and tranquility, so long as they harmonised in the truth of God's word, however dissimilar they might be with regard to ecclesiastical usages. It would almost seem from this, as if John's mind had begun to undergo a change; but the same year he decreed in his will that the confession and worship of the Christian faith, which, during the later period of his reign, and especially at his court, had been in practice, should also after his death be retained throughout the kingdom.

Evidently now the assembling of a Church council could no longer be delayed. Men's minds were ripe for such a step; and it was shortly taken, although not before John's decease. A circumstance which occurred immediately prior to that event, may serve as an indication of the feeling which at last became well-nigh universally preponderant. The king had given Stockholm a more perfect ecclesiastical organisation than it had hitherto possessed, by the appointment of additional clergymen to the churches of Riddarholm and St Clara. But through the imprisonment of others of the clergy of the capital (on account of the opposition to the liturgy), there was a lack of pastors for the High church; and John adopted the expedient, formerly resorted to, of calling ministers from the country to do duty, for a limited period, in the town. The bishop of Vexiö received orders to send for this purpose two clergymen from his diocese. The matter was considered at a diocesan meeting, when the king likewise requested information from the bishop and clergy about the adoption of the prayer-book within their bounds. Thus invited, they advanced reasons against its use, which show evident traces of the influence of the Strengnäs confession, and the controversial works of Abraham; and—singular metamorphosis!—as the Vexiö clergy had previously been the foremost to condemn their brethren in the duke's dominions, they now, headed by their bishop, were the

first to atone for such over-hasty and unloving conduct, by a determination to acquaint the sovereign with their repugnance to the liturgy, and to ask his permission to discontinue it henceforth. In a memorial to the king, they portrayed the unfortunate effects of its introduction, which had been accompanied by distress of conscience, religious doubts and scruples, all manner of suspicion and strife; they consequently entreated to be freed from its employment, so that they might be no longer bound in matters ecclesiastical by mere human laws, but might obtain true Christian liberty, which they would never misuse in the way of any carnal license; and they, therefore, begged that they might revert to the ritual in use before 1560. Last, yet by no means least in importance, was the pressing request that a convocation should be summoned, to restore peace and unity throughout the common fatherland; and by the decrees of that convocation they were willing, in future, to regulate their conduct. The two pastors who had been selected by the bishop to repair, according to the king's command, to Stockholm—Steno Magni of Vexiö, and Jonas Andreæ of Moheda—carried with them the above memorial, and delivered it into the hands of John. It reached him at a time when he was suffering from disease, and even anticipating the approach of death, but still disinclined to give up his old resolves. His answer to the memorial was couched in severe and upbraiding terms; the pardon of their wish to break the promise they had already made to him in the matter of the "Red Book," was all they could at first wring from the incensed monarch. It was, nevertheless, at the same time hinted, that the king would allow them to act with reference to the ritual, as they believed they could answer for it before God and the secular authorities. The two commissioners were reluctant to return with such a message to their brethren. Finally, they received a milder, but simply oral answer from King John, a promise that he would overlook their remissness in the employment of the liturgy.

The step taken by the bishop and pastors of the diocese of Vexiö, could not but awaken hope and happiness among those—and they formed the great majority of the nation—whose hearts were set upon the old order of things established in the Protestant Church of Sweden. Especially, according to Anjou, did the men who were still suffering for their opposition to the "Red Book," welcome, with glad and grateful hearts, the dawn of freedom's day. Both the deputies from Vexiö, who also, when preaching in the capital, had openly confessed their faith, received letters of congratulation from the Stockholm chaplains and imprisoned lecturers,—letters which bore evidence to the soundness of their creed, and de-

clared the warm sympathy of the authors. Abraham, that unwearied and undaunted anti-liturgist combatant, rejoiced when he heard of their courage, and their comparatively temperate reception by the king. And immediately thereafter, Bishop Olof of Vesterås, in name of an assembly of his clergy, transmitted to John a petition for relief from the obnoxious missal, the unthinking recognition of which was now lying like a load upon their minds. It is uncertain if their supplication ever reached the sovereign during his last long illness. "He had already," observes Anjou, "been led, by the hostility he encountered, to doubt, not indeed the truth of his own cause, but the possibility of giving it a continuous existence. To it he himself remained loyal, denying all relations with the pope, excusing his intermeddling in the church's affairs on the ground of their condition at the commencement of his reign, and on the ground, too, of the example of the ancient Jewish monarchs; and declaring, while dissatisfied with the revocation of their promises by the clergy of the diocese of Vexiö, that he yet declined to be the controller of their conscience." The protracted and bitter conflict had crushed his soul; and for the four last years, until within a few weeks of his death, he had refrained from receiving the sacrament of the Supper. Participation in it implied the pardon of those who had offended him; and he is then stated to have given orders for setting at liberty the persons who opposed his ecclesiastical innovations,—an event which did not occur, however, previous to his decease. He expired on the 17th November 1592. "*Hæc est mea catholica fides*,"—such, let us add, was the formula of his final confession,—words which, indeed, prove the complete sincerity of his belief, but which constitute notwithstanding one other solid seal attached to the painful historic truth, that theological and ecclesiastical amateurs (especially if eclectics) of the kingly order, are not unfrequently among the worst—although it may be unintentional—adversaries of the church of Christ.

King John's death foreboded a time of convulsion and conflict, both in Church and State, throughout the whole realm of Sweden. The closing years of his reign were for the Swedish people one of those critical epochs in a nation's life, when the obstinate and ambitious will of a single individual, exalting itself above law, or the use and wont that is stronger than law, declines to consult the interests of others, and thus brings all into confusion. The measure of his subjects' dissatisfaction was filled to overflowing; within the church, the obtruded liturgy began to be in general rejected, and the growing power of the opposition party, together with the prospect of his own im-

pending decease, had compelled the reluctant sovereign to give freedom to the persons imprisoned for disobedience to his former unjust commands. But greater evils than any now partially averted seemed in store for the not distant future. The Swedish estates had already done homage to the popish Sigismund, as his father's successor on the throne ; and from that prince's blind devotion to the Jesuits, as well as from the much more extensive influence he might be expected to exert in his capacity of a twofold monarch, the greatest inroads upon the church's freedom were sorrowfully apprehended. The experience of the last twenty years had, however, taught the church the secret of its true freedom. The sympathy or compliance with John's Romanising measures, which in part before existed, could not in any circumstances be anticipated to support the undisguised popery of Sigismund. The Swedish clergy and people had now amply proved themselves, and sworn to Protestantism their lasting allegiance. In order that they might preserve uninjured their most sacred possessions, it was requisite that they should seek firmer foothold against the assaults of their powerful foe, than could be afforded by the smooth and slippery pathway of a mediating ritual. And this very need it was that pronounced the liturgy's final doom.

All were agreed that the safety of the Evangelical Confession must be satisfactorily insured, before the kingly power was handed over to the hands of Sigismund. For if the "Red Book" were not rescinded prior to his return from Poland, where he had been residing since 1587, and from which country complaints had been made of the curtailment of Protestant liberties, it was to be feared that serious dangers might assail the freedom of God's word and the pure preaching of the gospel. Charles, who discharged the functions of regent during the absence of his nephew, clearly saw that the only way of establishing the Reformed Church upon a firm and immovable basis, was to carry into effect the universally expressed desire for an ecclesiastical convocation, and he, therefore, took immediate steps towards the accomplishment of that object. After he and the council of state had interchanged the assurance of a common intention to uphold the government of the realm until Sigismund's return, and also to maintain the true religion, according to God's pure word and the Augsburg Confession of Faith, the Duke, in his own and their name, issued a summons on the 9th January 1593, to the administrators of every diocese, enjoining them to repair to a synod, fixed to meet at Upsala on the 25th day of the next month, and which was to have for its business the restoration of concord with regard to ecclesiastical rites and ceremonies, the compilation of rules touching those matters and the general discipline of the church, and the elec-

tion of bishops and an archbishop. At the synod thus appointed, the head of each diocese was to be accompanied by the members of his chapter, by the deans, and by some of the most learned and able men in every district. As to the absent sovereign, *his* permission was neither sought nor waited for. The validity of the Duke's procedure rested on the commission which Sigismund had given to his uncle when he heard of his father's illness,—a commission empowering him, in case of John's death, to superintend the affairs of the kingdom until further instructions should be sent. Intimation of the intended synod was, however, despatched by Charles to the new monarch, and, in communicating it, the regent expressed his hope that the king would approve of the course he had adopted, and of the resolutions at which the synod might arrive. Sigismund's earnest promise, that he would preserve religious freedom, and "neither hate nor love" any one on account of his creed, inspired little real confidence.*

"The experience of seventy years," says Anjou, "lay between the assembling of the present synod and the time when the doctrines of the Reformation were first proclaimed in Sweden. The Romish hierarchy had been overthrown, and laborious efforts put forth to clear away by degrees the mass of errors which, during half the preceding millennium, had accumulated within the church. King Gustavus had willingly led a willing people to the work of Reformation; and since the revolt of Dacke, not an arm had been lifted for the defence of the old order of things, while only a few voices here and there were heard speaking in its support. But although the monarch and his subjects thus aimed at a common end, they had not too curiously scrutinised the several grounds of their united advance in precisely the same direction. Gustavus, during the last twenty years of his life, had acted upon principles that were prejudicial to the people's freedom in ecclesiastical affairs; but it was first when John through the violent application of these principles had wounded the love and interests of his subjects, and when Sigismund's own creed had threatened to inflict still deeper injury, that they found it high time to engage in active opposition. Thus, the very resolve to summon the synod of Upsala, formed a solemn protest against the principles of 1539, viz., that the sovereign possessed the right of determining the land's religion; and if the mere resolve was a protest, much more so was the synod itself, with its proceedings."

That ever-memorable synod or convocation assembled at the

* This promise was humorously interpreted to mean, that he would "Hate no Papist, and love no Lutheran."

appointed period,—on the 25th February 1593. Of bishops there appeared four,—Petrus Benedicti of Linköping, Petrus Jonae of Strengnäs, Olaus Bellinus of Vesteraas, and Ericus Erixi of Aabo ; the bishops of Skara and Vexjö were prevented from attending by reason of their advanced age. There were also present the four Upsala professors, Jacobus Erixi, Schinner, Kenicius, and Nicolaus Olai Bothniensis, twenty-two masters of arts, and about three hundred and six or three hundred and eight clergymen, exclusive of those who attended without being formally summoned thither. Duke Charles and nine members of the Council of State, along with many of the nobles and some of the representatives of certain towns and districts, were likewise there,—although they took no part in the Synod's deliberations and resolutions, with the exception of the members of Council. It was on the 26th of February that the proceedings commenced. Bishop Bellinus of Vesteraas delivered a long introductory address, in which he stated that the objects of the meeting were to determine on a confession of faith, on ecclesiastical ceremonies and discipline, and to elect an archbishop and bishops in the room of the aged prelates who now filled certain of the sees. He admonished to peace and unity, and the exhibition of mutual forbearance. The following day another address was given by Professor Erik Schinner, which sufficiently indicated the turn that the Synod's consultations were about to take. His theme was the Holy Scriptures and the study of theology ; he eulogised Luther and the services King Gustavus had rendered to the church, and launched forth against the liturgists, and especially those bishops who, although they ought to have perceived the evil tendencies of the "Red Book," yet, for court favour, supported the late sovereign in his attempt to force it upon the people, &c., &c. The real business of the convocation, however, began on the first of March, with a speech by the High Marshal, Nils Gyllenstjerna, who, in the name of the Duke and Council, bid welcome to the clergy, and announced that what King John had already promised, and the church so earnestly sought,—a *free* ecclesiastical Synod,—had now at last been vouchsafed. Harmony in belief and ritual was, he said, necessary even for the temporal repose and welfare of the nation, as was evident from the fierce conflicts which were at present raging in France and in the Netherlands. All now assembled should be prepared to declare their sentiments openly and unreservedly, and to assign the reasons why they held them. On behalf of himself and of his colleagues of the Council, he declared that they would abide by the Augsburg Confession of the year 1530, and by the ecclesiastical constitution which Archbishop Laurentius the elder, had prepared and introduced. He further asked the clergy who were there,

if they could promise and assure him that absent brethren would recognise and ratify the decisions of the Convocation, and was answered by unanimous assent. King Sigismund, he added, when he returned to Sweden, should not rule over their conscience and their creed,—wherefore he advised them to compile and severally subscribe a confession of their faith, which would be laid before the monarch for his royal sanction. The High Marshal concluded by invoking the blessing of God upon all the various labours in which they might be engaged. Shortly thereafter, the Synod proceeded to the choice of a president, when Professor Nicolaus Olai, an indomitable opponent of the liturgy, was elected by a large majority of votes. The first point now was to consider the all-important question of a confession; and for this purpose the Synod resolved to read over and deliberate upon the different articles of that of Augsburg, as the common ground-work of the Evangelical Lutheran faith. Day by day the public perusal of the Augsburg Confession was continued; and ere long it grew clearly evident, that there existed a wonderful amount of unanimity in the views with which the members of Synod contemplated the various points that it embraced. There was, it turned out, no need at all for a new formula of belief, or new symbolical standards. So, at the close, Bishop Petrus Jonæ stood up and asked the Council of State and the rest of the assembly, if they adopted the confession which had been thus solemnly read and discussed, and if they were determined to hold firmly by it, even should it please God to bring them into suffering in consequence? The whole Synod arose, and cried that they would never flinch from maintaining it, but be prepared to peril their lives for its defence. Then the president, in loud tones exclaimed, "Now is Sweden become as one man, and we all of us have one Lord and God!" After the successful completion of this first great work, the next important question,—the question of the approval or non-approval of King John's liturgy, or "Red Book,"—came before the Synod for their judgment. Any persons who had a word to say in its favour were invited to address the house. But not a single liturgist champion appeared, not a single voice was lifted up for the retention of that fatal missal which, during sixteen years, had caused such serious troubles within the Swedish church and kingdom. Sentence of doom having been, in a form so striking, recorded against it, the president turned to the bishops, and, in upbraiding accents, inquired why it chanced that they had accepted it? A solemn and formal act of renunciation was the answer. Foremost here were the three prelates who had been well-affected to the liturgy. Petrus of Linköping explained that,

partly through ignorance, and partly through the threats or wiles of those who were then chief rulers in the church, he had received the "Red Book"; he now confessed, in this respect, his error, and sought for forgiveness from God and the assembly. Bellinus of Vesteraas said that he had been misled by the explanations given of the real meaning of the liturgy, and appealed, as his excuse, to the circumstance that before John's death he had retracted his already signified approval. Erik of Aabo testified that he had only embraced the liturgy because he had deemed it compatible with the doctrine of God's Word. After the three dignitaries there followed a crowd of inferior clergy, who, in similar fashion, lamented and craved pardon for their error, which pardon,—after severe and, it must be confessed, in many cases well-merited rebukes,—they were permitted to obtain. So fell the notorious "Red Book"; its life had been a life of tyranny and trouble, and its death was one of feebleness and shame.

It is impossible for us to enter into the remaining numerous details of the Convocation of Upsala. We shall best, we believe, consult the exigencies of space and the interests of our readers, by giving a brief summary of the whole proceedings at the Synod, almost in the words of the general resolutions with which these proceedings were ultimately concluded. All, then, were agreed as to the following points:—

1. They would continue to hold fast by God's pure and saving word in the writings of the inspired prophets, evangelists, and apostles. They recognised these sacred scriptures as originating from the Holy Ghost, and containing in perfection all Christian knowledge; they believed them to be the pillar and ground of true Christian faith, and supreme judge in all religious controversy, without any appeal to the explanations of the ancient fathers, or any other person.

2. They further declared the unity and agreement of the Swedish Church with the Christian Church of the primitive ages, through its adoption of the Apostolic, Nicene, and Athanasian Creeds; with the Reformed Evangelical Church through its adoption of the Augsburg Confession of 1530; and with the preceding reformation of the Swedish Church itself, through the adoption of the ecclesiastical constitution established and held valid during the episcopate of Laurentius Petri, and the concluding years of the reign of King Gustavus I.

3. With regard to some of the ceremonies at baptism and the Lord's supper, retained in the ritual of Archbishop Laurentius, namely, the use of salt, lights, the elevation of the sacrament, and the removal of the prayer-book from one corner of the altar to another, &c., which ceremonies had been laid aside, on account of their abuse, in the first evangelical assemblies, the

Synod declared that both the parish clergymen and the bishops in their visitations should endeavour to clear away from the minds of the common people every tendency to misconstrue them. But if this could not be effected without the abrogation of the ceremonies themselves, then the bishops and representatives of the cathedral chapters, along with the most learned clergy of the diocese, were to meet and deliberate on the easiest mode of their removal without creating any unnecessary disturbance.

4. Inasmuch as the liturgy, "which some of the clergy in the realm had received," was the source of great commotion, being superstitious, and a stone of stumbling, because in reality quite similar to the popish mass,—it was formally condemned, with all its evil results in doctrine, ritual, and discipline. At the same time were rejected the errors of Papists, Sacramentarians, Zwinglians, *Calvinists*, Anabaptists, and all other heretics.

5. Ecclesiastical discipline was to be administered, as before, in accordance with the old church rules. But, since for a long period it had been much neglected, they now all pledged themselves to uphold it, and what was lacking in the printed regulations was to be supplied by the bishops and cathedral chapters of every diocese.

6. Although the Synod could not deem it strictly right that persons who held other forms of faith than the Lutheran should be allowed to settle in the kingdom, still, as such a settlement was requisite for the sake of trade and commerce, they resolved that it should not be permitted them to hold any public religious meeting in their houses or elsewhere, and threatened them with punishment if they were convicted of doing so, or of speaking scornfully of the national creed and form of worship.

7. Finally, they unanimously declared that they had bound themselves, by the Lord's help, to cleave fast and firm to these resolutions, commending their cause into the hands of Almighty God, whose divine power would protect them, and graciously enable them to stand ever steadfast in their defence.

On the whole, we may affirm that these declarations of the Synod of Upsala were essentially Protestant, as well as great and memorable resolves. Doubtless, there is not a little in them with which we members of the Reformed Church, as distinguished from the Lutheran, feel it impossible to sympathise; doubtless, there is not a little, besides, which we would repudiate altogether. But let us be just and impartial in our judgment; nay more, let us be generous and kind. Now-a-days we can well afford calmly to contemplate, with a half-smile of wondering sorrow, the theological narrow-mindedness which could class together Calvinists, Papists,

and Anabaptists, as equally convicted of atrocious heresy, and the intolerance which could refuse to all alike the enjoyment of religious freedom. Still, the cardinal principles of the Reformation are *there*, embodied in true and lasting shape; and the pure breath of our common Protestantism breathes through the greater part of the Synod's resolutions. Nor should we forget what modern European history owes to the decrees we have just summed up. Their solemn words are echoed back to us by the whirlwind-voice of those grand Protestant campaigns which bore Duke Charles's illustrious son, on the wings of triumph, into the very heart of Papal Germany, and by the battle-thunder that rolled so grandly, and yet so sadly, above the immortal field of Lützen. For, even as the resolutions of the Synod of Upsala involved no wild and wanton, no unnatural and convulsive severance from the past, they at the same time included the legitimate germ of much that was truest and noblest in the century about to follow.

The preceding resolutions were signed by the members present, and thereafter circulated through the kingdom, in order that all others might have the opportunity of appending their names. This was widely done by the most influential persons among the Swedish people. The subscribers, altogether, were Duke Charles, Gustavus Duke of Saxony and Westphalia, the grandson of Gustavus I., 14 councillors of State, 7 bishops, 218 knights and nobles, 137 civil officials, 1556 clergymen, the burgomasters of the 36 cities and towns of the realm, and finally, the representatives of 197 districts and provinces. Such an extensive subscription amply proves the enthusiasm and unanimity with which the great bulk of the Swedes regarded the results of the Convocation of Upsala. Only one step,—an indispensable one, however,—remained to be taken, viz., the procurement of the sanction of King Sigismund. It was still uncertain if he would agree to grant it. Vainly, indeed, did the Council dispatch Thure Bjelke to Poland, in the summer of 1593, to solicit the sovereign's compliance. Yet the fears they cherished for the king's ultimate refusal just bound the Protestant party still closer together, in their resolute determination to struggle to the uttermost in behalf of ecclesiastical freedom; and when Sigismund at last, after a protracted absence, landed at Stockholm on the 30th September of the same year, and was met there by Charles and the Council, with the clergy and the newly-chosen archbishop, Abrahamus Andreæ (the unflinching opponent of the liturgy, who had been elected to the primacy by the recent Synod), at their head, this latter circumstance was a tolerably significant hint that the Upsala Convocation would not

be forgotten, nor its decrees allowed to fall powerless to the ground. But the new king was most reluctant to comply. The autumn passed away in fruitless negotiations, and the delay naturally tended to exasperate the already bitter feelings on either side. With the next spring came the date fixed for Sigismund's coronation; and the progress of events, therefore, approached a crisis. In the beginning of February, the Swedish States assembled, and the archbishop having read the Upsala resolutions, inquired if they were willing to embrace them. The answer was a unanimous assent; and they also decreed that whoever might refuse to sign the resolutions, should be held incapable of holding any office, whether civil or ecclesiastical, within the realm. The king, after a series of vain efforts to get certain favourable conditions annexed to his royal confirmation, now saw himself compelled to yield to circumstances, and ratify the hated document. In token of thankfulness, *Te Deum* was sung the day after in Upsala cathedral, although the archbishop who intoned this *Te Deum*, and who, moreover, preached a sermon on the occasion, had not as yet received the king's approval of his appointment to his new dignity. It was not wonderful that Sigismund should withhold that approval as long as possible from one who had been the declared enemy, not merely of his own, but likewise of his father's faith. Nevertheless, it was in the end vouchsafed, and the following day, February 19th, Archbishop Abraham assisted at the coronation of the sovereign. Yet Sigismund was kindly spared the humiliation of receiving the crown and the other regalia from the hands of a hostile primate. The latter preached the coronation sermon, and prayed at the king's investiture with the regalia; but the ceremony was performed by Bishop Petrus Jonæ of Strenguäs. So Sweden's long and painful struggle had now reached its victorious close; Protestantism was legally established as the religious faith of her children; and the decrees of the Synod of Upsala, thus adopted by the people, and thus sanctioned by the prince, are the foundation on which rests the Swedish Reformed Church even at the present day.

We have now finished our necessarily brief and imperfect sketch of the Swedish Reformation, in the earlier and more important period of its history. We have followed its varying fortunes from the days of Olaus Petri and Laurentius Andreæ, when the tidings of the great Protestant movement in Germany first reached the Scandinavian kingdoms, and roused the interest and wonder of their inhabitants, downwards to the date of that noble consummation, the Synod of Upsala, when the labour of long years of trouble and trial was crowned with complete prosperity, and the edifice of the

Church's freedom was secured on an imperishable basis. Many pregnant lessons may be learned from the whole course of Reformation work in Sweden; but foremost of them all is the old ever-new truth,—the “Gott in der Geschichte” of Herder, the “Dieu en l'histoire” of D'Aubigne,—the fecund and perennial principle of the overruling providence of God. We would chiefly indicate as instances of this, the raising up, firstly, of Gustavus Vasa, and secondly, of Duke Charles, at the exact periods when the special gifts which they possessed enabled them to render such signal, nay, such indispensable assistance to the sorely-struggling Protestant cause. The famous founder of the Vasa dynasty was a chosen instrument in the hands of the Lord for the purpose of effecting His all-wise counsel; and it was just at the very hour when a guardian was needed for the infant Protestantism of Sweden that, in the mercy of divine providence, the destined guardian appeared. Political and ecclesiastical history combined, through the mysterious leadings of the same providence, to create a crisis which should stimulate the growth of the Reformation; and in the person of the first Gustavus there stepped forth one fitted to meet the manifold emergencies of the situation, and to bear the whole brunt of the mighty warfare on his own adamantine shield. Again, in his descendant and successor Charles,—himself the sire of a nobler and more heroic son,—there appeared a second instrument to achieve a second equally important aim, the nurture, namely, of the feeble youth of Protestantism, as his father had tended it throughout all the troubles and dangers that beset its earliest career. Simultaneously with the violent efforts exerted by King John to blast whatever was distinctive in its development, Duke Charles assumed his divinely-allotted place, and interposed once more the hereditary ægis of the Vasa vigour and the Vasa valour between the growing reformation and its foe. In Gustavus and Charles, then, we see living proofs of the existence of that master-key which alone unlocks the entire realm of marvels contained in history,—the supreme providence of the omnipotent Jehovah.

One word more, and we have done. Bishop Anjou concludes his admirable work with the thankful exclamation, “Praise be to the memory of our fathers for the goodly heritage they have thus transmitted to their children.” Cordially do we concur in this well-merited eulogium, and sincerely do we trust that the Swedish people will long look back with gratitude to the crowd of stately figures which fill their past political and ecclesiastical history, nay,—what is of greater importance,—will strive to prove that gratitude by walking in the footsteps of their sires. Most true are the

lines of their present sovereign,—true in a sense far higher than that intended by the royal author,—

“ Asa-runes
Still are left us,
Rock-engraven,
Moss-o’ergrown ”; *

and filial affection commands the duty of clearing away the debris from ancestral monuments, and restoring the heroic shapes of the Reformation era afresh to the light of day. Imperishable historic “runes,” Christian “runes,” Protestant “runes,” are the splendid dower of the Swedish nation; and we would humbly counsel them to read and re-read those runes until their deep spiritual meaning is indelibly imprinted in the memory. For there is danger lest the Swedes, while doing all outward honour to the names of their old Reformation worthies, should somewhat forget to cherish the profound religious spirit that distinguished them. We rejoice, indeed, to know that in the Swedish Church there are many pious and zealous pastors, who find their main delight in the furtherance of the work of God. We rejoice to know that she possesses comparatively pure gospel standards,—in all vital points essentially Protestant,—and that no desire has ever been evinced for their mutilation or rejection. We rejoice to know that among her rulers are men like Archbishop Reuterdaahl and Bishop Anjou,—men who may rank with the noblest of her chiefs at any former period of her annals. Moreover, we believe that the clergy and people of Sweden are too intensely Protestant ever to allow themselves to be seduced from the path of Reformation light and freedom, by the Romanising tendencies so prevalent at the present day. No; it is from another quarter that peril seems to threaten the Lutheran Church of Sweden,—not from her ancient foe in the seven-hilled city, but from the rationalistic wildernesses and swamps of Germany. Let her, then, gird on anew her evangelical armour, and do brave battle with Rationalism in its every form, with religious indifference and coldness, until they be utterly expelled from her borders. Among European nations, we inhabitants of Britain,—whether south or north of the Tweed,—should anticipate with peculiar interest the advent of such a happy consummation.

“ In all things we are sprung
Of earth’s best blood, have titles manifold.”

* “ An dock staa
Asa-runor
Ivar i hällen,
Mossbelupna.”

—*Dikter af C. F. (Charles XV).*

And in that "best blood," of which, with pardonable patriotic pride, our late great poet speaks, unquestionably not the least powerful, not the least noble element, is the Scandinavian. To the Swedish people, therefore, we would say once more, Go on and prosper. Wage with Rationalism an unsparing warfare; and may your church, freed from aught that dulls and deadens the true principle of religious vitality, ere long "look forth as the morning, fair as the moon, clear as the sun, and terrible as an army with banners!"

J. J.

ART. II.—*Analytical Commentary on the Romans.*

Analytical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans; tracing the train of thought by the aid of Parallelism: with Notes and Dissertations on the principal difficulties connected with the Exposition of the Epistle. By Rev. JOHN FORBES, LL.D., Edinburgh. T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. 1868.

THE design of this commentary, as stated by the author, is twofold. 1. To furnish a specimen of such an analysis and arrangement of the text, as seems most desirable for the reader to possess in entering on the study of a difficult book of Scripture. 2. To give a fair and full illustration of the importance of Bishop Lowth's discovery of the parallelistic structure of Scripture,—a discovery which he alleges is yet destined to throw a new and clearer light on a great part of the sacred volume.

For the proof of the utility of the principles of this system of parallelism, the author refers more especially "to the perfect order and perspicuity which it introduces into what has generally been considered a very intricate and perplexed passage, ch. v. 12–21; and to the new light in which it exhibits that passage as containing the central, animating thought of the whole epistle." By the application of the principles of parallelism to this passage, Dr Forbes claims to have shown that "the leading thought is not, as usually stated, justification by faith as the leading doctrine of the epistle—presented, as has been objected to the bare forensic theory, in the cold, lifeless form of imputation,—as if by a legal fiction and mere outward reckoning of Christ's righteousness, believers were justified without any necessary change passing immediately upon the heart. The grand truth here enunciated," our author holds, "is the warm, living reality of a personal UNION with

Christ (contrasted with the previous union with Adam), by which, in place of the 'SIN' and 'DEATH' communicated by the first head of humanity, Christ's 'RIGHTEOUSNESS' and 'LIFE' are communicated to the believer, and become the inward, quickening mover of every thought, feeling, and action."

In this way, Dr Forbes alleges, "the distinction is preserved, and yet the indissoluble connection clearly evinced between justification and sanctification, as being but two aspects of one and the same UNION of the believer with Christ—just as the dying branch ingrafted into the living vine, is then only reckoned, and may justly be declared to be, a sound, living branch when the union has taken place—because the assurance is then given of its being *made* so finally and fully, the vital juices of the vine having already begun to circulate within it."

Such are the objects of this work, and such the advantages of the system of exegesis which it is designed to illustrate, as set forth in the preface. With regard to the merits of the system of parallelism, there is no need to enter into any special examination of its claims. There are few who will be led by anything the author has said in its favour, here or elsewhere, to believe that the entire volume of inspiration, including its prose as well as its poetry, has been so artistically composed and arranged, that word is balanced against word, line against line, thought against thought; and that this artistic structure, "in its more simple form, at first confined to the reiteration, or amplification, in a second line of the thought expressed in the first," at length "began to be extended to triplets, quatrains, and even five, six, and seven-lined stanzas;" and eventually "since a more complex idea could not be expressed adequately in the compass of a single line, a couplet, instead of a single line, came to be placed in parallelism with another couplet, or a triplet with a triplet, quatrain with quatrain, &c., until at length the love for exact arrangement and symmetrical order found full gratification only when it extended to the entire composition, so as to combine its various parts into one organic whole"—p. 69. Common sense must ever prove a sufficient antidote to such a theory of the structure of a book designed by infinite wisdom for the enlightenment of mankind. Parallelism may be good, if the passages to which its principles are applied be parallel; but the commentator, swayed by a particular theory, may imagine a parallel where no parallel exists. At any rate, it is allowable to say, that no plan, or method, or principle of exegesis can confer immunity from error. The result in every case will be determined, not simply by the system of exegesis, but by the mental capacity, the doctrinal and philosophical bias, and the subjective spiritual estate of the exegete.

To this rule, the work under review is no exception. Whilst it gives evidence of fair scholarly attainments, and is pervaded by a spirit of genuine Christian courtesy towards those from whom the author differs, it, nevertheless, furnishes unquestionable proof that, in many instances, the doctrine has determined the parallel, and not the parallel the doctrine. Indeed it may be fairly charged that, in some cases, the previously entertained doctrine has led the author to do violence to the parallel as stated by himself. As an instance in point, the reader is referred to the following parallelism between our ruin and our recovery, as sketched on page 203:—

“ For as by the disobedience of the one man
The many were *made sinners*;
Even so by the obedience of the one man
The many shall be *made righteous*.”

On this passage, and the previous verse, Dr Forbes remarks: “The doctrinal precision of Paul’s statement in the order of the topics is remarkable. In mentioning the two evils introduced by Adam, sin precedes, death follows—sin as the cause; death as the effect, ver. 12. But in the removal of these evils (ver. 18 and 19) the order is reversed, deliverance from death, or ‘justification of life,’ is placed first (ver. 18); deliverance from sin, or sanctification, is placed last (ver. 19). Justification is thus shown to precede, in the order of thought and causation: sanctification follows.”

Now the analogy between the order in the ruin and in the recovery, as stated by the apostle, and as exhibited in these parallel lines, certainly does not warrant the statement, that the order observed in the removal of sin and death is the reverse of that in which these evils were introduced. In the one case, the offence of one brings condemnation on all,—the disobedience of one makes the many sinners. In the other, the righteousness of one justifies all,—the obedience of one makes the many righteous. The points of the analogy are, the disobedience of the one man, Adam, and its effects, and the obedience of the one man, Christ, and its effects. Adam’s disobedience brings condemnation and death; Christ’s obedience brings justification and life. Adam disobeyed, and his posterity are condemned; Christ obeyed, and those for whom he stood are justified. What evidence is there here of a reversal of order? In both cases the order of the divine procedure is the same. In the one, Adam’s disobedience is made the judicial ground of dealing with his posterity; in the other, Christ’s obedience is made the judicial ground of dealing with his people.

The alleged reversal of order is solely the offspring of Dr

Forbes's theory of righteousness and justification. Holding, as he does, that the righteousness which justifies the sinner is a subjective quality, an attribute of the Saviour, and that justification is a subjective, moral rectification, arising from the impartation of this quality, or attribute, to the soul, he is led to confound justification with the impartation of life, or, as he characterises it, deliverance from death. In this way, he concludes, despite the express teaching of the apostle in the passage cited, that the order of the recovery is the reverse of the order of the ruin.

Nor is the order affirmed by Dr Forbes simply in conflict with the order as stated by the apostle; it is also in conflict with his own teaching on the subject of justification. If justification be a subjective rectification of the soul, arising from the impartation of the righteousness of Christ, considered as an attribute, is it not manifestly all one with deliverance, so far forth, from sin? Our author cannot fall back on the distinction between an initial communication of Christ's righteousness and the full impartation of the same; for the only difference in the two cases is a difference of degree or measure, and not of kind. The subjective impartation of righteousness at the outset, cannot be regarded as differing from the subjective impartation of righteousness at the close of the process of moral rectification, in any other sense than that of degree. If, then, as our author holds, the process, subsequent to its initiation, may be characterised as a deliverance from sin, surely there is nothing in the first act of communication so different from those which follow, as to necessitate a reference of it to a different category. If the first act, and the second act, and the third act, &c., be simply acts whereby righteousness is subjectively communicated, what warrant is there for representing the first as a deliverance from death, and the second and third, &c., as a deliverance from sin? But if the initial communication of righteousness may be regarded as a deliverance from sin, there is no ground for alleging, as Dr Forbes does, that the order of events in the recovery is diverse from the order in the ruin, inasmuch as sin, the evil which is first in the ruin, is confessedly removed, so far as there is any change at all effected in the condition of the sinner, by the very first act in the process of recovery.

The only door through which our author can attempt an escape from this difficulty, is one of which he avails himself occasionally to avoid the charge that his theory confounds justification with sanctification. He may allege that the communication of righteousness as a subjective quality has a two-fold effect: first, Deliverance from death; second, Deliverance from sin. Here again, however, the order, when correctly

stated, is against Dr Forbes. The order, as stated by him, is an impossible order. Deliverance from death, *by a process of subjective rectification*, cannot precede deliverance from sin as a subjective estate. The death which is the penalty of sin, whether it be regarded as temporal, or spiritual, or eternal, can be removed only by the previous removal of sin, whether sin be regarded as an actual transgression of, or as a want of conformity to, the law of God. If, as our author teaches, the communication of righteousness, whereby a sinner is justified, be an operation which makes him spiritually alive, it must produce this effect by a previous destruction, to the same extent, of the indwelling, death-producing, power of sin. If to be carnally minded is death, the only way in which the soul can be delivered from death, is to be delivered from its own carnality. Hence, even on Dr Forbes's own theory of justification, the order would be exactly the reverse of what he alleges, and the order of events in the recovery, instead of being at variance with the order of events in the ruin, would be in absolute harmony therewith. However, then, the subject is viewed—whether in the light of the passage under consideration, or in the light of the theory of a subjective justification, or righteousness, as Bushnell calls it—there is no warrant for the conclusions deduced by our author from this passage. As death is the wages of sin, as it is by sin that death enters, as sin sustains to death a causal relation, there can be no deliverance from death except on the condition of a previous deliverance from sin. Until the cause is removed, whether that cause be meritorious or instrumental, there can be no removal of the effect.

As might be expected, from the nature of the theory entertained by the author on the subject of justification, its influence in this epistle is not confined to one or two passages. The fact is, the work seems to have been written for the purpose of establishing the doctrine of a subjective justification. This idea has controlled and regulated everything. The parallels into which the text has been distributed, and the departures from the ordinary translation of the original, from the beginning of the first chapter to the close of the eleventh, have been determined by this one all-absorbing, all-controlling thought. So thoroughly animated is the author by this idea, that, in addition to the arguments advanced in support of it in the body of the commentary, he has given us special dissertations on almost all the correlated subjects, such as, "The Righteousness of God," "Comparison between Adam and Christ," "Difference between Adam and Christ," &c., &c.; and in all these the central idea is, justification by a subjective rectification. Standing on the lofty eminence of this one idea, he beholds not only

all the doctrines of the epistle harmonized, but the mysteries of the Holy of Holies with its sacred furniture revealed. The author thus concludes a dissertation on the expression "The Glory of God": "All the three expressions" (the love of God, the righteousness of God, the glory of God), "are brought into the finest harmony, as all pointing to the same thing—all denoting originally what belongs to God *possessively*, as His essential perfection—'God's righteousness,' 'God's love,' 'God's glory;' yet all as communicable to man by virtue of his union with God through Christ Jesus, by whom he can be rendered a 'partaker of the divine nature,'" p. 175. In harmony with this style of comment, is the language employed at the close of the dissertation on "The Righteousness of God":—"All righteousness is of God. There is therefore but one righteousness, and that 'the righteousness of God,' whether exhibited by God himself, by Jesus Christ, or by believers in Christ," p. 144. In this sentence we have the fundamental thought of this theory of justification, and the formative idea of this analytical commentary.

In the special dissertation on the "The Righteousness of God," pp. 105-6, the author opens up his whole mind on this subject as follows:—

"How then are all these three meanings of the Righteousness of God (1, as his personal attribute; 2, as imputed; and 3, as imparted to the believer), to be fully reconciled? By rising, we reply, to the largeness of the Apostle's conception and corresponding language, and perceiving that it is *God's own righteousness* which is now revealed by the gospel, as being brought into contact with man, and rendered capable of communication to him, that he may become a partaker of the divine nature, 2 Pet. i. 4; which, while God pronounces the believer to be righteous, yet evinces that he himself is righteous by the awful penalty which he exacted for sin in the atoning death of his own Son; a righteousness which, while it is imputed by the gracious sentence of God to those who have been hitherto ungodly and confessed sinners, *will yet*" [mark the expression] "prove the truth of God's sentence by its immediate implantation in the heart, and by the progressive but ultimately perfect renewal of his whole nature in holiness. It is, in fine, *God's own righteousness* (for there is none other) which, being gloriously manifested in all its fulness and extent in the incarnation, life, and death of his blessed Son, is communicated to all who become united with Christ by faith, and ingrafted into him as branches into the living vine, so that all that is his becomes theirs. *Legally* regarded, his righteousness is their justification; *morally* regarded, their sanctification. These two can never be separated in fact, however necessary or useful it may be to distinguish them in thought. They are but two aspects of one and the same thing—of Christ in union with the believer, received and appropriated by faith as "the Lord our righteousness," "that we may be made the righteousness of God in

him,' 2 Cor. v. 21. Regarded as *in him*, as branches in the living vine, and become members of his body, we are *declared righteous*, or justified as being part of him, the righteous one. But if we are *in Christ*, he is *in us* (compare Rom. viii. 1 and 10), as the life of the vine is in the ingrafted branch, and has changed the whole current of our thoughts, feelings, and life, his Spirit animating us as the Lord our righteousness or sanctification.

"For the clear perception of the truth with regard to justification, it is of great importance to see that it is to Christ alone received into the heart by faith, as *he is in himself*, and *will finally make us*, that regard is to be had in our justification, not to what he *has already made us*, or will, so long as we are in this world, make us; the righteousness which he imparts to us while here below being still defiled and imperfect through an admixture of the evil derived from our old man, and therefore incapable of justifying.

"But while this distinction between justification and sanctification is most important, and worthy of all the labour bestowed upon it by our Reformers to clear it from every obscurity, we must still carefully guard against the *exclusively* forensic use of this phrase—'the righteousness of God'—as tending to foster error on the opposite side. Justification has in some minds come to be regarded as a sort of merely legal sentence, pronounced by God as it were *outside* of the sinner, and which might for a time at least have no corresponding *inward* reality; as somewhat similar to the sentence of an earthly judge which might absolve a criminal, and yet leave him in heart the same man it found him. No word of God is thus false and imperfect, like the vain word of mortals. As pronounced by God, justification is a creative word. 'He saith and it is done.' When he pronounces righteous, he makes righteous, not in entire immediate reality, but in certain prospect; not entirely, we say, if we regard the whole *complex nature* of the old and new man, since the old man, though slain, still lingers on for a time, but perfectly in the *new man* then born, who cannot sin because he is born of God (1 John iii. 9). But even regarding the complex nature, the moment God justifies or declares righteous, the great change is begun. The man has passed from death unto life. The prevailing bias of his whole nature is reversed. The heart is changed from the love of sin to the love of holiness. That germ of righteousness is immediately implanted, in all its completeness and integrity of parts, which will hereafter expand in due and orderly development, 'first the blade, then the ear, and finally the full corn in the ear.' Christ is received into the heart as a *whole*, "the Lord our righteousness," for justification not alone, but for sanctification also."

In a note, page 107, the author makes the following additional observation:—

"It is important for the elucidation of other expressions in this epistle ('the love of God,' 'the glory of God,') to observe that in all these meanings of 'righteousness,' even when it refers to the believer as righteousness *imputed* and righteousness *imparted*, it is still called 'the righteousness of God' (that is, *God's* righteousness in a possessive sense), as indicating that even when it becomes ours,

it is still originally and truly God's, an emanation from the above source of all righteousness."

It is due to the author to make this lengthened extract from his book, as it is but fair that he himself, and not his reviewer, should state what his views are on this all-important subject. On this point the above extract is sufficient. There can be no doubt entertained by any one who will examine it, in regard to the author's views on the subject of justification. "Justification," according to the doctrine of this passage, and the central doctrine of this commentary, "is a *creative* word." "When God pronounces righteous he makes righteous." The subject of the justification, it is true, as Dr Forbes admits, is not made righteous "in entire immediate reality," but he is "in certain prospect," and it is in reference to this subjective change of the sinner, that God speaks when He justifies him or declares him righteous. The decision has reference to a "germ of righteousness immediately implanted in all its completeness and integrity of parts, which will hereafter expand in due and orderly development." The truth of this decision is yet to be proved, but proved it will be, as our author alleges, by the immediate implantation in the heart of this germ of righteousness, and "by the progressive but ultimately perfect renewal of the whole nature in holiness." As the author remarks, p. 108, "What God declares is virtually as good as done, though not now perfectly, nor even during the whole of the believer's life here below, yet eventually he shall be made altogether righteous, as certainly as if the change had been instantaneously completed." Justification, therefore, as we are told, is not a declaration based on "a legal fiction," but a declaration based on a *fact*, that fact being neither more nor less than a subjective estate of righteousness to which the sinner is, at the time of the declaration, in part restored, and to which he shall be perfectly restored hereafter. The man is pronounced righteous because he is, or shall be, truly and perfectly righteous. The ground of the declaration is a perfect subjective righteousness, possessed by the person concerning whom it is made.

Equally explicit is the passage above cited in regard to the nature and source of this subjective righteousness. The doctrine laid down on this point is, that "it is God's own righteousness" considered as his personal attribute. This righteousness—and it is alleged that there is no other—"manifested in all its fulness and extent in the incarnation, life, and death of His blessed Son, is communicated to all who become united with Christ by faith, and ingrafted into him as branches into the living vine, so that all that is his becomes theirs. Legally regarded, his righteousness is their justification; morally regarded, their sanctification." The ground of the sinner's justi-

fication, therefore, is God's own personal attribute of righteousness, and the gospel is the grand expedient whereby this attribute is "brought into contact with man," and rendered capable of communication to him." After citing in a note, p. 105, the passage, "there is none good but one, that is God," the author remarks, "This seems to be one reason why the expression almost universally used in Scripture is 'the righteousness of God' (once only 'the righteousness of Christ,' 2 Pet. i. 1, if it be an exception), to remind us that there is but *one righteousness*. It is by him in whom 'dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily' that believers are rendered righteous, and 'made partakers of the divine nature.' He is one with God, and therefore 'the Lord our righteousness.'" And still more expressly, if possible, on p. 143, in answer to the objection, "How can one of the essential attributes of God be communicated to a creature?" is this doctrine of the communication of this essential attribute of God to the sinner avowed. The answer given is, "We know not any more than we know how God could become man, the infinite be united with the finite, the divine with the human." The ground taken in these passages is, as already stated, that the righteousness of God, considered as his personal, essential attribute, is communicated to the believer, and thus communicated, becomes the ground of his justification. In a word, to cite a passage already referred to, from p. 144, the doctrine of our author is, that "there is but one righteousness, and that 'the righteousness of God,' whether exhibited by God himself, by Jesus Christ, or by believers in Christ." The righteousness, therefore, which the believer obtains through union with Christ, and on the ground of which he is justified, is that essential attribute of righteousness which he possesses as a person of the Trinity.

The points embraced in this theory of justification are the following: 1. That the judicial ground of justification is a righteousness subjectively communicated to the believer; 2. That this righteousness is God's own personal attribute. The theory, therefore, is one worthy of grave consideration; for the points embraced must affect, radically, the views of those who adopt them, on the whole subject of the nature and design of Christ's work, and the ground of the sinner's acceptance before God.

The doctrine, it will be observed, although at first sight resembling the Romish doctrine of justification, differs from it in one important particular. According to the view of Romanists, "the sole formal cause of justification is the righteousness of God; not that by which he himself is righteous, but that by which he maketh us righteous; that, to wit, with

which *we*, being endowed by him, are renewed by Him in the spirit of our mind, and we are not only reputed, but are truly called, and are righteous, receiving righteousness within us, each according to his own measure, which the Holy Ghost divides to every man severally as he will, and according to each one's proper disposition and co-operation." In accordance with this view, Romanists hold that justification is capable of increase. They who are thus justified, "through the observance of the commandments of God and of the church, faith co-operating with good works, increase in the righteousness received through the grace of Christ, and are still more justified, as it is written, He that is righteous, let him be righteous still." The Romish doctrine agrees with the doctrine of Dr Forbes in regard to the principle, that the ground of the believer's justification is a subjective, inherent righteousness, but it differs in regard to the nature of this subjective righteousness. The righteousness of the Romanist consists of three graces,—faith, hope, and charity; whilst the righteousness which this book represents as the ground of the believer's justification, is no less, and no other, than the personal attribute of God himself. This the Romish authorities, as the passage above cited shows, expressly deny.

It is scarcely necessary formally to prove, that the doctrine of justification advocated in this commentary is not the Protestant doctrine. It cannot be said that it even resembles it. According to the Reformers, and according to the Symbols of the Lutheran and Reformed churches, justification is exactly what our author denies it is, viz., a purely forensic act, the ground of which is external to the believer, of itself affecting his external, legal relations, but not his inner, subjective estate. Melancthon states correctly the doctrine of the Lutherans when he thus defines justification: "Justificatio significat remissionem peccatorum, et reconciliationem, seu acceptationem personæ ad vitam eternam. Nam Hebræis, justificare est forense verbum, ut si dicam: Populus Romanus justificavit Scipionem accusatum a Tribunis, id est, absolvit, seu justum pronuntiavit. Sum sit igitur Paulus verbum justificandi ex consuetudine Hebraici sermonis, pro remissione peccatorum, et reconciliatione seu acceptatione." After stating that, when God remits sin, He, at the same time, bestows the Holy Spirit, as the worker of new virtues or graces in the soul, Melancthon is careful to guard against the inference, that the subjective renovation is the ground of the justification. Speaking of the graces thus infused, he says, "quæ etsi comitantur reconciliationem, tamen nequaquam judicandum est nostrum dignitatem *aut munditiem* causam esse remissionis peccatorum."—(*Loci Præcipui Theologici De Grat. et Justif.*) When Melancthon denies that our

worthiness, or our purity, is the cause of the remission of our sins, he denies what this novel theory of justification affirms; for the attribute of God's righteousness, which it represents as imparted to the believer, and which constitutes him subjectively righteous, is the sum and substance of his subjective purity, as it is also the ground of his acceptance before God.

Still more expressly does Witsius repudiate the doctrine advanced by Dr Forbes. In commenting on 1 Cor. i. 30, on the words, "Who of God is made unto us righteousness," Witsius remarks, "But ours it is either inherently or by imputation, for there is no third supposition. Inherently it is not; for in this sense Paul opposes it to ours, Philip. iii. 6; neither does the nature of the thing permit that acts furnished by Christ should be inherently ours. It remains, therefore, that this righteousness is ours by imputation,—God imputing righteousness to man without works" (*De Œconomia Fœd.*, Lib. III. cap. viii. sect. 37).

The Swiss and French confessions may be taken as specimens of the testimony of all the Symbols of the Reformation:—

"Justificare significat Apostolo in disputatione de justificatione, peccata remittere, a culpa et pœna absolvere, in gratiam recipere, et justum pronunciare."—(Helv. Conf., cap. xv.)

"Itaque ceteras omnes rationes quibus homines existimant se coram Deo posse justificari, plane repudiamus, omnique statutum et meritorum opinione abjecta: in sola Jesu Christi obedientia prorsus acquiescimus, quæ quidem nobis imputatur, tum ut tegantur omnia nostra peccata, tum etiam ut gratiam coram Deo nansciscamus."—(Conf. Gal., sec. xviii.)

On this subject, the Westminster divines speak with their wonted precision, as follows: "Those whom God effectually calleth he also freely justifieth; not by infusing righteousness into them, but by pardoning their sins, and by accounting and accepting their persons as righteous; not for anything wrought in them, or done by them, but for Christ's sake alone: not by imputing faith itself, the act of believing, or any other evangelical obedience, to them as their righteousness, but by imputing the obedience and satisfaction of Christ unto them, they receiving and resting on him and his righteousness by faith; which faith they have not of themselves; it is the gift of God."—*Conf.* chap. XI. sect. 1. The doctrine here taught is, that the ground of the believer's justification is neither his own nor his Saviour's subjective righteousness; but that righteousness which consists in, and arises from, the obedience and satisfaction rendered by Christ to the law and justice of God. In a word, the doctrine of our standards, and the doctrine of Protestant christendom, on this subject is, that the righteousness, on the ground of which God justifies men, is not his own or his Son's personal attribute, but a righteousness wrought

out by his own Son, as the sinner's substitute and surety, by the perfect obedience of his life, and the sin-expiating sufferings of his death.

Whilst the Reformers have not, *in their Symbols*, discussed the specific theory in regard to the ground of justification advocated by Dr Forbes, they have refuted, in the generic, the theory under which it is embraced. Whilst they have not formally stated, refuted, and rejected the doctrine, that the ground of the pardon and acceptance of the believer is the righteousness of God or of Christ, considered as a personal attribute, they have taught the contrary: 1. By teaching that justification is a forensic act; 2. By teaching that the righteousness, on the ground of which the believer is justified, is not infused or inherent; 3. By teaching that the ground of the believer's justification is the satisfaction which, by his obedience and death, Christ has rendered to the law and justice of God. There is not a Symbol of the churches of the Reformation, Lutheran or Reformed, in which the doctrine of justification is stated, and defended against the misrepresentations of the Church of Rome, in which these points are not expressly stated and sustained by arguments; nor is there a theologian who has undertaken to state and maintain the doctrine of the Reformers on this subject, who has not taken the ground, that justification is a forensic act, affecting the believer's external legal relations, and based, not upon an infused or inherent righteousness, but upon the finished work of Christ, as our surety and substitute. One of the leading questions between the Reformers and their adversaries was, "Whether that inherent righteousness, which is found in believers during the present state, enters into our justification, either as its cause or as a part thereof, so that it constitutes some part of our justification, and is a meritorious cause and foundation, in the judgment of God, of the sentence by which we are absolved?" Of this question the Reformers took the negative, and the Romish theologians, together with the Council of Trent, the affirmative. In view of this fact, it is certainly difficult to see how Dr Forbes can claim to be on the side of the reformers on this vital point. He has certainly acted wisely in not giving references, and in not mentioning authorities. As he advances this claim, however, it is but proper that he should have leave to state the ground on which he rests it.

His doctrine, he alleges, "in no way interferes with the great Protestant doctrine contended for so earnestly at the Reformation, that the justification of the believer is an act of pardon and acceptance passed at once upon the sinner immediately on his believing, with reference to the perfect righteousness of Christ alone *imputed* to him, and not to the measure of righteousness at first *infused*; which, being im-

perfect, even throughout the whole of the Christian's life on earth, since the remains of the old man are still found in him, could never justify in the sight of the heart-searching God. This," continues Dr Forbes, "we strenuously maintain. It is as regarded only *in Christ Jesus* (and not at all in respect to what the man is in himself, or has been made, even by the grace of God), that God justifies the believer, having respect solely to the perfect righteousness exhibited by Christ in human nature."

"What we contend for is a fuller meaning to be attached to the word 'justify,' or *pronounce righteous*, when spoken of God, than is generally assigned to it, viz., that Christ is, in justification, to be regarded and reckoned as the source of *righteousness* in the full extent of the word's signification, that is, of perfect and unqualified exemption, not only from guilt, but eventually from the *power* of sin. Christ's righteousness is reckoned to the believer as the certain means of removing, not the *condemnation* alone that rests upon him for sin, but the grounds of that condemnation, *sin* itself, and of communicating to him its opposite righteousness. *Reckoned*, observe, we have said. The true distinction between justification and sanctification is thus fully maintained,—that justification is but an *imputation* or reckoning of that which is not the believer's own, but belongs to another; whereas sanctification is its impartation."—P. 110.

Dr Forbes, in a note on this page, very properly remarks:—

"It will be evident that thus an equally extended signification must be given to the word '*imputation*' also. As usually stated, it is with a view to the *pardon* of sin alone, and acceptance of his person, that Christ's righteousness is said to be imputed to the believer, thus giving some colour to the objection, that it is by a mere legal fiction that God justifies, or declares righteous. Whereas if it were distinctly stated and recognised that *all* that Christ has done is imputed to the believer as his in certain prospect, immediately on his acceptance of the Saviour; that it is reckoned in the eye of God, and of faith, to be of as certain attainment as if already his in full possession, so that Christ is his for *sanctification* as well as for justification, much of the offence taken against this doctrine would be removed."

The success of this attempt of our author to harmonise his doctrine with that of the Reformers is very questionable. The doctrine which he ascribes to the Reformers, and with which he harmonises, turns out to be not the doctrine of the Reformers at all. He represents them as teaching that the act whereby the sinner is pardoned and accepted, has reference to the perfect righteousness of Christ imputed to him, as distinguished from the measure of righteousness at first infused. The distinction here made is twofold: (1.) In regard to the *quantum* of righteousness, on the ground of which the sinner is pardoned and accepted; and (2.) In regard to the terms "*imputed*" and "*infused*." With regard to the former point, our author discriminates between the perfect righteousness of Christ and the

measure of righteousness at first infused. The former is that which justifies; the latter does not, and cannot. The reason, however, is not to be found in the nature of the righteousness, but in the measure of it infused in the present state. God, in justifying, has regard to the perfect measure of righteousness actually found in Christ, and ultimately communicated to the believer. If the question be asked, as it is, p. 111, "With what propriety can God be said to 'justify the ungodly'?—that is, to declare righteous those who yet fall far short of being righteous;" the answer which Dr Forbes would give is, that "God, who sees the end from the beginning, declares not that which immediately *fully* is, but that which shall be. The believer is righteous 'before God, who quickeneth the dead, *and calleth those things which be not, as though they were.*'" According to our author, then, the doctrine of the Reformers, in regard to the ground on which the ungodly are justified, is the perfect righteousness which they shall ultimately *fully* possess, and not the imperfect measure of righteousness at first infused.

As to the second point, as might be expected from what has been just observed, the distinction is a distinction without a difference at all affecting the doctrine, that the ground of justification is a subjective righteousness,—a righteousness possessed by the believer now in imperfect measure, but ultimately fully possessed. Dr Forbes does distinguish imputation from infusion, but the imputation which he recognises, whether in the case of Adam's sin or of Christ's righteousness, is an imputation based and founded on infusion, or communication, or impartation. The righteousness of Christ is regarded by him as imparted or reckoned, because it is at the time of the imputation in measure infused, and because it will, ultimately, be fully imparted. The doctrine advocated is, that God imputes, or reckons righteousness to none who do not actually possess it. The vindication of the sentence whereby the ungodly are pronounced righteous, is to be found, not in the work of Christ done for them, but in the work carried forward within them, by which they are transformed into his own subjective moral condition, by the communication of his moral attribute of righteousness. This is the doctrine which our author teaches in this book, and for which he claims the high authority of the Reformers. Of the warrant for such a claim, the reader is now in a position to judge. If there is any doctrine which the Reformers have taken special care to repudiate, it is the doctrine of justification on the ground of an infused righteousness; and if there is any doctrine which they have been zealous to inculcate, it is the doctrine of justification on the ground of Christ's righteousness imputed, as distinguished from Christ's righteousness infused.

Dr Forbes endeavours, pp. 220–1, to reconcile the language

of the Reformers with this doctrine, by representing them as simply objecting to the Romish doctrine, "which gives to works a share in the justification of the sinner (which they ascribe to the righteousness *previously* infused into the believer)." The point in this Romish view, to which our author regards the Reformers as objecting, is that, according to the Romanists, there is a righteousness infused before justification which does not justify, but which merely enables the sinner to perform works which contribute to his justification. That is, if we are to credit Dr Forbes, the Reformers rejected as a ground of justification, works done by virtue of an infused righteousness, but did not object to the infused righteousness itself as the ground of justification. It so happens, however, as the Symbols of the Protestant churches show, that the Reformers objected to both. Our author admits that they rejected the former, and the passages already cited from Melancthon, &c., prove that they as unequivocally rejected the latter. In opposition both to good works and to righteousness subjectively infused, they proclaim the obedience and death of Christ as the only ground of the sinner's pardon, and of his acceptance as righteous in the sight of God. The fact is, Dr Forbes' theory is neither more nor less than the theory of Osiander, which was broached about the middle of the sixteenth century, and was condemned by Melancthon, Calvin, Mastricht, Turretin, Markius, Leydecker, &c., &c.

But, in the next place, this doctrine of justification on the ground of an infused righteousness, is inconsistent with Dr Forbes' own principle, viz., that justification "is not a mere legal fiction," but a creative act, that "in the mouth of God (*δικαίω*) is a creative word;" that "when God justifies or declares a man righteous, it must be implied that he is, in some sense, *righteous*," p. 108. The ground here taken is, that if God should pronounce a man just, or righteous, without making him subjectively righteous, the declaration would not be in accordance with truth. "When Christ said to the leper, 'Be thou clean,' he became instantly clean, not merely outwardly and ceremonially, but inwardly in his body, whether the change was immediately visible to the beholder or not," p. 109. This passage is cited not because of its cogency as an illustration or argument, but because it expresses our author's idea of justification. With him, justification is a subjective process whereby an ungodly man is made godly, holy, righteous, and therefore, to pronounce one just or righteous who had not undergone such a subjective change, were simply to affirm an untruth. Now, it seems somewhat strange that Dr Forbes should regard his theory of justification as free from this objection. It seems remarkable that he should have failed to discover, that it is really the only theory of justification against

which this objection can be fairly urged. It is his own theory, and not the theory of Dr Hodge and the Imputationists, which represents God, in the act of justification, as declaring what is not true. According to the doctrine of the Imputationists, God, in justification, proceeds upon the ground of a work done by the believer's substitute, which not only secures the pardon of his sins, which have by that divine work been expiated, but entitles him also to the reward of the divine favour and eternal life. Is there any untruthfulness or unrighteousness in this procedure? Is it an untruth to declare that the believer is pardoned and accepted as righteous for the sake of the obedience and death of his Covenant Head and Surety? Is it an untruth to say that there is no condemnation to those who are in Christ, or unrighteous to accept as righteous those for whom the preceptive and penal claims of God's law have been met by such a Sponsor? As the ground of the declaration is altogether external to the believer, and as the declaration has regard to his external legal relations, nothing in his subjective estate can be cited in proof of the unrighteousness or the untruthfulness of the sentence whereby he is pronounced just.

It is not so, however, with the theory of our author. The announcement made when the ungodly are justified, is not true, if it implies, as he alleges, that the sinner is made, then and there, subjectively righteous. Dr Forbes has not been insensible to this difficulty; but there are few who will be satisfied with the method by which he has endeavoured to obviate it. He admits that the believer is not what, according to this theory, he is declared to be, at the time the declaration is made; but he thinks he has fully met the difficulty, by alleging that he is such "*potentially*" at the time of his justification, and that he will be such really and perfectly hereafter! That is, the divine declaration whereby the believer is, according to this theory, pronounced righteous subjectively, is true, because he is potentially and prospectively righteous! What but the exigencies of a theory could bring a man to accept for himself, or to offer to others, such a solution as this! God may in truth and righteousness pronounce the believer just, or righteous, for he is potentially righteous now, and will be really and perfectly righteous hereafter! What does this amount to, but a confession of the untenableness of the theory of justification advocated in this book? After all, the fact is, that what is said is not true if this theory be true. The sinner who believes in Jesus is said in the Scriptures to be righteous; so righteous, that there is no condemnation to him; so righteous, that he is at peace with God; so righteous, that God sees no unrighteousness or iniquity in him; so righteous, that the entire array of enmity is challenged to lay anything to his charge; and yet, if we are to believe our author, his right-

eousness is only incipient, potential, prospective ! And this antagonism of the declaration with the actual state of the case, let it be observed, is the offspring of a theory which lays it down as a fundamental, "that it is not by a mere legal fiction that God justifies or declares righteous"—the offspring of a theory which insists, that when God pronounces a man righteous, he must be what he is declared to be ! In a word, as has been fully shown, the objection urged by Dr Forbes against the doctrine of justification as held by the Church of God, the objection which has led him to abandon that doctrine, lies, not against that doctrine at all, but against the doctrine which he has adopted for the very purpose of obviating this same objection.

Still more objectionable will this theory of justification appear, when the nature of the subjective righteousness, on the ground of which the believer is pronounced righteous, is considered. The doctrine taught on this point is, that the righteousness whereby, or on account of which, the sinner is declared righteous, is the righteousness of God considered as his own personal attribute, subjectively imparted to the believer. For proof of this charge, the reader is referred to the passages already cited from pages 105 and 143-4. How one of the essential attributes of God can be communicated to a creature, Dr Forbes does not attempt to say, but thinks there is as great a mystery in the doctrine of the Incarnation, p. 143. This door of escape from a theory involving such consequences is, however, not available ; for the doctrine of the Church of God on the subject of the Incarnation, carefully eschews and repudiates the idea, that the attributes of the divine nature of Christ were communicated to the human. The union of the divine and human natures in the one divine person of the Mediator, is a mystery ; but it differs from the mystery advanced by our author in this important particular, that it is simply above reason, whilst his is contrary to it. Duality of natures does not necessarily infer duality of persons ; but the communication of the attributes of one nature to another, infers, of necessity, a transmutation and confusion of the natures concerned. Attributes necessarily infer essence, and have no existence apart from essence. Any change of attributes necessarily infers a corresponding change of essence ; for it is only through the medium of its attributes that the essence is manifested. To say that the attributes are changed, is simply to say that the essence is changed ; and this is all one with saying, that it is a different essence from what it was prior to the alleged change. He who ascribes to matter the attributes of spirit, ascribes to it also a spiritual essence ; and he who ascribes to spirit the qualities of matter, does thereby identify spirit with matter ; for essences are distinguished from each other only by their attributes.

When, therefore, it is said, as it is by our author, that the righteousness of God, considered as a personal attribute, is imparted and communicated to the believer, it is implied, of necessity, that the essence of God is imparted and communicated to him ; for the attribute must have, as its *ὑποκείμενον* and *substantia*, the infinite essence of God. From that essence it is, and must be, inseparable. It not only cannot subsist apart from it, but it cannot have a subsistence on the basis of any other essence. The attribute is where the essence is, and the essence is where the attribute is. The believer can be a partaker of this or any other divine attribute, only in so far as he is a partaker of the divine essence. The divine attribute cannot subsist in the human essence as its *substantia*, and, therefore, cannot be communicated or imparted to it so long as it remains a human or finite essence unchanged. Before the essence of the human soul can furnish a suitable basis for such an attribute, it must cease to be human or finite, and become infinite and divine. In a word, the impartation or communication of the righteousness of God, for which Dr Forbes contends, is impossible on any other condition than that of the deification of human nature. His theory of justification, therefore, is simply a theory of deification. If man can be just or righteous, only on the ground of his having imparted or communicated to him the righteousness of God, considered as an attribute, he must become God before he can be justified.

Nor can the theory rest with the deification of man. If there is no righteousness save the righteousness of God, as our author insists, it must follow that there can be no righteous beings of any order in the whole array of moral intelligences in the whole universe, except those to whom that righteousness has been imparted. And this is all one with saying, that there is but one moral essence possessed in common by God and all righteous moral beings. Dr Forbes cannot save his theory, and reject this conclusion. If the text, "There is none good but one, that is God," mean what he says it means, there is no possibility of avoiding the irreverent conclusion, that all righteous moral beings are possessed of that one goodness or righteousness, and are partakers of the only essence in which such righteousness can subsist or inhere ; that is, that all righteous moral beings are divine !

Nor is this the ultimate goal of this moral theory of justification. The terminus towards which it points, and which it must eventually reach, once it passes out of the hands of its present adherents, such as Drs Bushnell and Forbes, into the hands of a logician, is the absolute, *essential* unity, or rather unification, of all moral beings. If there is but one righteousness, and that righteousness a personal attribute of God, it must follow that there is and can be but one righteous being ;

for one attribute cannot be distributed over a number of distinctly subsisting essences. The Persons of the adorable Trinity can, and do possess the *same* attributes, although they have a distinct subsistence as Persons; but this arises from the community of the one essence which obtains in the Godhead. Hence, whilst the Father is almighty, and the Son almighty, and the Holy Ghost almighty, there are not three almighties, but one almighty. In a word, unity of essence implies unity of attributes, and, conversely, unity of attributes implies unity of essence. Where there is but one essence, there cannot be more than one set of attributes; and so, on the other hand, where there is but one set of attributes, or, as in the present case, but one attribute, there can be but one essence, an essence common to all who possess that one attribute. And if this attribute is common to all righteous moral intelligences, there can be but one righteous moral Being in the universe; for unity of essence is all one with unity of being.

It were too much of a compliment to call this doctrine Pantheism. Pantheism is not chargeable with the absurdity of the transmutation of diverse essences. That system acknowledges but one essence, and regards all the phenomena of the universe as but the ever-evolving phases of this one essence. This system acknowledges diversity of essence, and assumes the possibility of the transmutation of one essence into another, of the finite essence of man into the infinite essence of God!

The reader will be surprised when he is told, that in support of the two fundamentals of this preposterous theory, Dr Forbes advances just two texts of Scripture. In proof of the principle, that there is but one righteousness, he cites Matt. xix. 17, "There is none good but one, that is God;" and in support of the principle that this one attribute can be communicated to men, he cites 2 Pet. i. 4, "That by these ye might be partakers of the divine nature." With regard to the former of these proof-texts it will be sufficient to remark, that it does not teach what our author alleges, that there is but one goodness or righteousness. It is one thing to say, as our Saviour does in that passage, that there is none good but one, and a very different thing to say, as Dr Forbes does, that there is no goodness but one. According to the one statement, there is but one being who is absolutely and infinitely good; whilst according to the other, there is but one attribute of goodness, and none are good who do not possess that one attribute. These statements are not simply diverse, they are contradictory. The interpretation given by our commentator is, that there is but one attribute of goodness, or righteousness, which, as his theory assumes, may be communicated to untold millions of moral beings, and which, if this theory of justification be true, was, at the time our Saviour uttered the words in

question, possessed by thousands of glorified saints. If so, then it could not be true, except on the unification theory, that at that time there was but one good, viz., God. This latter, however, is what our Saviour says. He says there is but one good, and specifies the one who is good, singling out God from the entire array of creaturely forms of excellence. The interpretation is, therefore, directly contradictory of the plain meaning of the passage.

But, further, it is quietly assumed in this novel interpretation, that "good" (*ἀγαθός*) means "righteous" (*δίκαιος*). It is needless to say that there is no warrant for such assumption. One or two instances may suffice on this point. In Rom. v. 7, these terms are certainly distinguished: "For scarcely for a righteous man (*δίκαιος*) will one die, yet peradventure for a good man (*ἀγαθός*) some would even dare to die." And so again, Matt. xx. 15, "Is thine eye evil because I am good (*ἀγαθός*)?" These instances may serve to shew, that before a commentator assumes that "good" means "righteous," he should defer to the intelligence of his readers, so far at least, as to assign some reason for the assumption. If, however, "*good*" does not mean "*righteous*," the one passage on which our author founds one of his fundamentals, cannot serve him as a proof-text. If it means, as it obviously does in the passages just cited,—generous, kind, beneficent, it cannot be regarded in the passage relied on by our author, as necessarily meaning that righteousness, or rectitude, which meets the claims of God's law. That it does mean kind, generous, beneficent, would seem to be demanded by the context. The truth is, the only being who can be said to transcend in his treatment of others, all the claims arising out of their relations to him, is God. When our deeds of generosity, our acts of kindness and beneficence, are viewed in the light of the relations we sustain, and the obligations under which we are placed, they can scarcely be said to deserve the name. The more we contemplate the claims which others have upon us, as the possessors of a common humanity, and the children of the same heavenly Father, the more will we be inclined to the conclusion, that "there is none good, kind, generous, beneficent, but one, that is God."

The passage, 2 Pet. i. 4, which is cited in proof of the communicableness of this righteousness to man, is liable to like objections. The expression, "that by these ye might be partakers of the divine nature," might, so far as the terms embraced in it are concerned, mean what our author says. It might mean that believers are partakers of the nature of God, in the sense of possessing that nature as a thing subjectively communicated. But will any intelligent man say, that a commentator is entitled to put upon every phrase of Scripture, any or every meaning which the words will bear?

Is a commentator, as well as a translator, not to be ruled in every instance by the requirements of the context, the scope of the whole, and the analogy of the faith? In the instance before us, not to refer to other terms in this expression, the meaning we attach to it will depend on the import of the term "partakers" (*κοινωνοί*). This term will admit the meaning which the exigencies of our author's theory demand; but it will also admit the meaning of "*associates*." The term *κοινωνία* expresses the idea of fellowship, or communion, or intimate intercourse, and the term *κοινωνοί* is applied to those who enjoy such fellowship. It is, therefore, a perfectly legitimate interpretation of this passage, to say that it represents believers as raised to the high rank of an intimate fellowship and communion with the divine nature, a fellowship and communion carried on as the context shows, through the forth-putting of the divine power, and through the instrumentality (*διὰ τοῦτο*) of the divine promises. Can any man who has read the Bible, and who is not a Pantheist, hesitate as to which of these interpretations he will adopt? The one, that adopted by Dr Forbes, involves, as we have already seen, the monstrous doctrine of the impartation to man of the ineffable essence of the self-existent Jehovah; whilst the other demands simply what the entire volume of inspiration teaches, viz., that "we have fellowship (*κοινωνία*) with the Father and with his Son Jesus Christ," by the Holy Ghost, whose *κοινωνία*, or fellowship, is embraced in those exceeding great and precious promises, of which Peter speaks in the passage under consideration, and for which Paul prays in that benediction, which, as the dew of Hermon, has distilled its heritage of blessings upon the Church through all the long night of her sore tribulation.

The theory of justification held by Dr Forbes, lays him under obligation to advance some theory in regard to the design of Christ's work. If it is not the work done by Christ, in satisfaction of the law and justice of God which justifies the believer, the question, of course, arises, 'Of what use or service was that work?' If it is a personal attribute of Christ which becomes the ground of our justification, what need was there for the obedience of his life, and the sore agony of his death? To this question our author feels bound to return some answer, and his answer is this, "That by Christ's offering a complete satisfaction to God's righteousness, in its judicial aspect, in bearing its penalty as our representative, and by his enabling us cordially to subscribe to the just condemnation of our sin, as represented in his death for us by our dying with him unto sin, and yielding this mortal body willingly to the grave, as the appointed means of our cure, we may be prepared to receive the righteousness of God in its saving character, as now communicated by Christ to all that are born again anew and risen with him; so

that the righteousness of the law (that is, that which the law demanded, but could not impart) may never be fulfilled (fully accomplished) in us, who walk not after the flesh but after the Spirit."—Pp. 120–1.

The account here given of Christ's work is, not that it *achieves*, but that it *reveals*, a righteousness. The righteousness which it reveals, however, is not a righteousness which saves or justifies, but a righteousness which condemns. The work of Christ reveals the righteousness of God in its judicial aspect. This is the sum total of all that the *work* of Christ effects. "By Christ's offering a complete satisfaction to God's righteousness, in its judicial aspect, in bearing its penalty" (that is, the penalty of the law) "as our representative," there is given a demonstration of the righteousness of God in its condemning character. This revelation of God's righteousness is employed to convince us of the justness of our condemnation, and prepare us "to receive the righteousness of God in its saving character," as a thing communicated to us in the new birth, in measure, and hereafter fully communicated. In a word, Christ's work, as related to God's law and righteousness, has regard simply to the *penal* claims which that law and righteousness have upon us; and his work, as related to us, meets these claims and convinces us of our need of the righteousness of God as a subjective quality, infused into our souls, which is the ground of our personal acceptance with God as righteous.

On this account of the immediate effect and design of Christ's work, it may be remarked,—1. That there is some truth in it. It is true that in the death of Christ, as our representative, there is given to men a convincing proof of the righteousness of God in its condemning aspect. It is also true that this revelation of the righteousness of God is the only one capable of producing, or which actually produces, that conviction of sin which leads the sinner to feel his need of another righteousness than his own, and compels him to submit himself to the righteousness of God.

2. It is obvious that this theory of Christ's work is fundamentally defective. Dr Forbes represents Christ's work as designed to meet but one class of the claims of God's law and justice—viz., the penal. Christ, as viewed by him, is simply a sin-bearer, and his work a work of expiation. Christ has to do with the guilt of men; for the law and justice of God demand that sin shall be punished. This class of claims Christ meets by his death as our representative; and when these claims are met, there is no obstacle in the way of the impartation of that subjective righteousness "which the law demands but cannot impart."

In this sketch of Christ's work, however, there is a grave omission—an omission of that part of Christ's work whereby

he met, for his people, the *preceptive* claims of God's law. It is true that some Protestant theologians have regarded Christ's work somewhat in this light,—one class restricting the satisfaction made by him to those sufferings which he endured in immediate connection with his crucifixion ; whilst another class restrict his atoning work to his sufferings, but include, as Symington does, under the head of sufferings, all that he endured from his birth to his death. This, however, is not the doctrine of the Symbols of the Churches of the Reformation, or of those theologians who are the recognised expounders of those Symbols; nor is it the doctrine of the Scriptures, in regard to what is comprehended under the work of Christ. The doctrine of God's word, and the doctrine of Protestant Christendom, in regard to this subject is, that the work of Christ embraced a full satisfaction to the law of God, in respect both to its penal and its preceptive claims upon those for whom he became surety. The preceptive claims of the law—its claims in regard to the *agenda* and the *fugienda*—upon Christ as the sinner's Surety, Dr Forbes entirely omits, and by doing so prepares the way for substituting, as the ground of our acceptance, the personal righteousness of God as a quality infused, instead of the righteousness arising from the all-perfect obedience of Christ. This is manifestly to ignore all that the Scriptures teach, both in regard to the preceptive claims of the law, and in regard to the ground of our justification. The law does demand truth in the inward parts ; it does require a subjective conformity to its perfect standard of holiness. But, in addition to this, it demands conformity of action. "This *do* and thou shalt live;" "the man that *doeth* them shall live by them;" "cursed is every one which continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law *to do* them." The law, therefore, demands a *service*—a service in which all the powers of the soul are engaged. It is not meeting the requirements of the law, to be conformed subjectively to the standard of moral excellence. "*Peccatum est inconvenientia actus aut status hominis cum divina lege.*" This is the "*forma peccati*," the idea of sin as set forth in all the writings of the Reformers, and in all the Symbols of the Reformation. He, therefore, who will meet for himself, or for others, as their substitute, the claims of a law which takes cognizance of actions, must, by his obedience, satisfy its precepts. Subjectively holy he must be, for the service demanded must spring from holy principles ; but the existence of the subjective principles can never be taken in lieu of their exercise in the service of God. It is not enough that he possess the principle of love towards God and man, but he must have that love in active exercise. The summary of the law is, "to love the Lord our God with all our heart, and with all our soul, and with all our strength, and with all our mind, and our neighbour as our-

selves." From these unquestionable principles it is manifest, that Christ must present to the law more than a perfectly holy nature and an expiatory sacrifice : he must also meet the preceptive claims of a law demanding an active service, by an all-perfect obedience. This we argue from the nature of the law of God, and the claims advanced for it in Scripture ; and to the same conclusion we are conducted by the express reference of our justification to the obedience of Christ, as distinguished from our own obedience. There is no man, except the man who is involved in the meshes of some antagonistic theory, who can read intelligently the first five chapters of the Epistle to the Romans, without coming to the conclusion reached by the Apostle, that the obedience of Christ is one of the leading elements in our justification. On this point all the arguments bear. 1. The Apostle shows that the wrath of God is revealed against all, whether Jews or Gentiles, who *live* not in accordance with the law of God. 2. He proves, *by their works*, that neither Jew nor Gentile possesses the righteousness which the law demands. 3. He proclaims a righteousness which neither could *win* by the works of the law, which nevertheless does not make void, but, on the contrary, establishes the law, and, therefore, a righteousness which meets its preceptive claims by furnishing the works which neither Jew nor Gentile could supply. 4. In the analogy instituted between Adam and Christ, the things put in contrast, or comparison, are, the disobedience of the one and its effects, and the obedience of the other and its effects. "For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous." If this mode of argumentation do not proceed upon the assumption that the preceptive, as well as the penal, claims of the law are to be met, in order to the justification of the sinner, it would certainly seem difficult to devise a mode better suited to produce that impression. If the law demands works—works which no man, Jew or Gentile, can perform, and for the non-performance of which it condemns both, and brings in the entire world guilty before God—surely a righteousness, which, when appropriated by faith, justifies the sinner and establishes this same law, must embrace an all-perfect obedience, meeting its preceptive claims as well as an all-atoning sacrifice, by which its penalty was exhausted.

3. The foregoing remarks on this theory very naturally lead to the additional observation, that the righteousness of God exhibited in the obedience, sufferings, and death of Christ, must be regarded, not only as a *condemning* righteousness, but as a *saving* righteousness—a righteousness which, whilst it condemns sin and executes the penalty due to it upon the sinner's substitute, righteously exempts the sinner himself from that penalty, and justifies him on the ground that all the claims of

the law, preceptive and penal, have been met by his representative. Dr Forbes does speak of the saving aspect of God's righteousness, but this aspect of it, according to his account, does not come out in Christ's work. According to his representation, the righteousness of God in its saving aspect or character, is a thing communicated in the new birth, and is therefore a phase of God's righteousness manifested, not in the impetration, but in the application, of redemption. Now, as has been already shown, if Christ's work revealed the condemning aspect of God's righteousness, it must also have revealed that same righteousness in its saving aspect. If it was righteous to condemn the substitute and inflict upon him the penalty, it must be unrighteous not to deliver those for whom that substitute obeyed and suffered. The only answer that can be given to the question, "How can a righteous God thus treat the Son of God?" is, that the Son of God was throughout regarded and treated as the sinner's substitute; and the only answer that can be given to the question, "How can a righteous God justify the ungodly?" is, that the Son of God has been set forth as a propitiation through faith in his blood. It is true, as Dr Forbes argues from Romans viii. 3, that in Christ's sufferings there is a revelation of the righteousness of God in its *condemning* aspect; but it is equally true, as the apostle states, Romans iii. 25, that Christ has been set forth a propitiation to declare the righteousness of God in *justifying* the ungodly. That is, the apostle argues, that the entire vindication of the divine procedure in justifying men, whether under the Old Testament or the New, is to be found in the propitiation made by Christ. This is a very different representation from that given by Dr Forbes. According to his account of the matter, the vindication of the divine procedure in justifying him that believeth in Jesus, is to be found in the prospective subjective transformation of the person justified by the infusion of the righteousness of God, considered as a personal attribute. According to the apostle, the vindication is to be found in the propitiation made by Christ. According to the one view, the vindication is to be found in Christ infused; according to the other, it is to be found in Christ crucified.

The Church of God will not have much difficulty in deciding between the claims of these antagonistic theories. The inmost and deepest convictions of God's people, as well as the testimony of Scripture, are against the theory of Dr Forbes. No Christian man ever thinks of referring to the measure of subjective righteousness to which he has now attained, or to which he hopes to attain hereafter, as the ground of the pardon of his sins and of his acceptance with God. The ground on which the Church of God rests, and the ground to which she ever looks for these, and all the other benefits of redemption, is the

all-perfect work of her Redeemer as her federal Representative and Surety. The man who singles out his own subjective estate as the ground of his standing as a righteous person in the sight of God, does violence to his own convictions, and speaks a language at variance with the experience of God's people.

Besides, as already stated, this theory is in direct opposition to all that the Scriptures teach on the subject. Whether we turn to the Old Testament or the New, we must see that the ground of the sinner's acceptance is to be found in the satisfaction of the law by his Substitute. This is the doctrine illustrated and taught symbolically by the sacrificial system of the Old Testament, and it is the doctrine proclaimed by the one sacrifice of the New, whereby we have been reconciled unto God. In the one case, as well as in the other, expiation and propitiation are inseparable. In both, the sinner stands accepted; not for what he is, or shall be, nor for what his Substitute is subjectively, but for the satisfaction made by his substitute to the law and justice of God. In neither is there any countenance given to the doctrine advanced in this commentary, viz., that atonement simply reveals the righteousness of God in its condemning aspect, and prepares the sinner for receiving the righteousness of God in its saving character. The doctrine taught, both under the Old Testament and the New, is that the object, and end, and actual effect of an atonement is the *satisfaction* of God,—embracing under that idea, the removal of the divine wrath, the securing of the divine favour, with their inseparable correlatives, the forgiveness of sin, and the acceptance of the sinner as one for whom the claims of the law and justice of God have been satisfied.

From this subject, the transition is easy to the theory of imputation taught by our author. As is his theory of justification, so, of course, is his theory of imputation. As the sinner is declared just or righteous, not on the ground of a work done for him by his Substitute, but on the ground of the righteousness of his Saviour infused into him, it follows, as a matter of necessity, that imputation is not a reckoning to the account of the sinner of what his Substitute has wrought out for him, but a reckoning to him of what is subjectively imparted unto him. As Dr Forbes contends for a fuller meaning to be attached to the word "justify," or *pronounce righteous*, so does he also contend "that an equally extended signification must be given to the word 'imputation' also," p. 110. In sanctification, the righteousness of Christ, as a personal attribute, is *imparted* to the believer, and in justification, this same righteousness, thus imparted, is *imputed* or *reckoned* to him. The imparted

righteousness, therefore, is the basis, both of the justification and the imputation. In a word, the theory of imputation held by our author, is just the theory held by Placeus, which was condemned as an innovation by the Reformed Church of France, viz., the theory of a mediate and consequent imputation, as distinguished from an imputation which is antecedent and immediate.

His views on this subject are still more fully brought out in his strictures on the theory of imputation propounded by Dr Hodge, in his commentary on this same epistle, and in the *Princeton Review*. Although the mere fact that our commentator condemns and rejects the views of Dr Hodge on this subject is, of itself, sufficient to condemn both himself and his theory in the judgment of all orthodox theologians, it is but fair that he should have a hearing :—

“The connection,” he observes, page 217, “between Adam and his posterity designed by the apostle, in Rom. v. 12–21, is of the most intimate and vital nature, and not merely of the outward and legal character insisted on by Professor Hodge in his commentary, whom we name simply as being one of the ablest and most consistent exponents of the interpretation which finds nothing but the mere imputation of sin and righteousness in this passage. By dwelling so exclusively as he does on imputation, he gives to the whole subject a merely superficial character. God is represented as acting in an arbitrary manner ; imputing sin where there is as yet no real sinfulness ; imputing righteousness, where yet perhaps no immediate moral change takes place. . . . Nothing, indeed, can be more entirely opposed to the spirit of the passage, than the unnatural disjunction that has been made of the *guilt* and the *corruption* (the italics are Dr Forbes’) of sin as conveyed to Adam’s posterity We must not attempt to disconnect the guilt from the corruption of sin. Sin is personified as a principle, an active power, which entered into human nature, at once in its corrupting and condemning power.” . . . “We are not therefore sinners only by imputation, but sin is a living, active principle inherent in the child, which shews its real existence, as soon as he becomes capable of any moral act.”

“Any defect,” Dr Forbes continues, “in our mode of viewing original sin, must lead to an equally defective mode of viewing the opposite side of the parallel—the communication of Christ’s righteousness to the believer. So long as it is conceived that by a mere forensic act and legal fiction, Christ’s righteousness is imputed to the penitent without any real change immediately and necessarily passing on the believer himself, it is impossible to take the full comfort and joy of this doctrine home to our hearts. Only then, when the believer comes to the full apprehension of the truth, that as really and truly as, by natural birth, sin is an essential part of our nature, . . . even so, by the spiritual birth and vital union with Christ, righteousness becomes an inherent part of the believer’s nature, and, however small and imperceptible at first, will demonstrate its efficacious presence by

the thorough change and assimilation which it will gradually make of every part to itself,—then, and then only, will he experience the full joy and peace in believing, which this blessed truth is fitted to impart. If the imputation of sin is not a mere forensic act which, for the time at least, may have no inward corresponding reality, with as little truth has the imputation of righteousness (or justification) been regarded as a mere outward forensic act, which has no inward corresponding reality. In justification, God's word and act are simultaneous. While he declares the sinner righteous for the sake alone of Christ's all-perfect righteousness, he, at the same time, makes a complete change upon the heart, and turns it from the love of sin to the love of holiness."—Pp. 217-19.

The doctrine of imputation and justification advanced in this passage, fully justifies the remark made by Dr Forbes in regard to the importance to be attached to right views on the subject of original sin. It is obvious that his views in regard to our relation to Adam have determined his views in regard to our relation to Christ. Holding, in the one case, that it is in virtue of the innate corruption communicated to us through our natural relation to Adam, in the natural birth, that sin is imputed to us, he is led to hold, in the parallel case, that it is on the ground of a righteousness infused into believers, in the spiritual, or new birth, that they are declared or pronounced just or righteous. In a word, holding, as he does, the doctrine of mediate, and consequent imputation, in the one case, he is led to hold it in the other; and, of course, rejects the doctrine of immediate and antecedent imputation, or, as he styles it, "the bare imputation theory," advocated by Dr Hodge. As it has proved in Dr Forbes's case, so has it ever been in the history of this subject. The doctrine of a mediate imputation of the sin of Adam is, historically as well as logically, inseparable from the doctrine of the mediate imputation of the righteousness of Christ. Those theologians (for no church has ever adopted the doctrine) who have taken the ground that we are condemned on the ground of a sinful nature derived from Adam, have invariably held that we are justified on the ground of a subjective renovation in some way or other communicated by Christ. The dispersion of the Huguenots prevented the full development of the Placean theory in France.

Even a casual examination of the passage above cited, will satisfy any competent judge that our author has not fully stated the imputation theory as held by Dr Hodge, and with him, let it be understood, by the entire Protestant Church. Neither Dr Hodge, nor any other advocate of that theory, has ever taught that in the justification of the sinner, "Christ's righteousness is imputed to him without any real change immediately and necessarily passing upon him." On the contrary,

the advocates of the doctrine of an immediate imputation, by their teaching in regard to the relation subsisting between justification on the one hand, and regeneration—faith and repentance—on the other, have rendered such a charge utterly groundless. By teaching that God justifies none who are destitute of the graces of faith and repentance, and, in addition to this, by teaching that none but the regenerate can believe or repent, the advocates of the doctrine in question, have left any man, who alleges that the doctrine of immediate imputation involves such a conclusion, or justifies such a charge, without excuse. Neither in the one case nor in the other—neither in the case of the imputation of Adam's sin, nor in that of the imputation of Christ's righteousness—has the ground been taken, that the imputation is unconnected with any subjective change. With the former, there is connected a judicial withdrawal of the divine favour, followed by the loss of the image of God, and the corruption of our whole nature. With the latter, there is connected the restoration of that favour and image, and ultimately the absolute sanctification of our entire nature.

But whilst Dr Hodge, and, with him, the churches of the Reformation, both Lutheran and Reformed, have taught that there is a subjective change very intimately connected with imputation, in both cases they have at the same time been careful to teach, that in neither is the imputation founded on the subjective change. In the case of the change connected with the imputation of the sin of Adam, the loss of the divine favour, and the corruption which follows, are penal evils of which that sin is the judicial ground. In the case of the change connected with the imputation of Christ's righteousness, the regeneration of the soul is the act of the Holy Spirit, whom Christ, as our covenant Head and Surety, has purchased, by his obedience and death, the right of sending to restore in us the lost image of God. They have been vigilant in guarding against the very dangerous error into which our author has fallen, when he connects the subjective change with the imputation, as a cause is connected with its effect, or a foundation with the building it is designed to sustain.

On the doctrine of imputation advocated in this commentary, it may be remarked: 1. That it reflects upon the justice of God. Dr Forbes makes this charge against what he is pleased to designate as "the bare imputation theory," which, as he alleges, represents the divine procedure as perfectly arbitrary. The fact however, is, that the charge of arbitrariness lies, not against the theory he opposes, but against the theory he advocates. According to the theory of immediate and antecedent imputation, in every case,—in that of Adam and his posterity, and in that of Christ and his people,—there is a

ground for the divine procedure, which justifies and vindicates it. In the case of Adam, the sin whereby he broke the covenant, is the judicial ground of the condemnation of the race. That sin is the ground of God's withdrawing both from the federal head and those he represented in the covenant. In the case of Christ, the obedience and sufferings whereby he fulfilled the conditions of the covenant of grace, constitute the ground of the justification of those for whom that obedience was rendered, and for whom those sufferings were endured. Is there any ground for the charge of arbitrariness here? Is it not manifest that the only course open to the impugner of the procedure in either case, is to attack the federal principle which underlies both economies? Except the adversary succeed in proving that it was wrong to appoint Adam and Christ the federal head of their respective seeds, he can never succeed in satisfying any right-minded moral intelligence, that it was wrong or arbitrary to reckon to those represented, what was performed by their federal head acting in his federal capacity.

But no such vindication can be set up for the theory of a mediate and consequent imputation of sin or of righteousness. According to this theory, there is no imputation of sin apart from an actual subjective estate of sinfulness; and no imputation of righteousness, except on the ground of a real, substantive, subjective estate of holiness. Now, as children are born in a state of spiritual death, and as spiritual death is certainly one of the elements of the penalty of a broken law, how comes it that this element of the penalty of transgression is inflicted on those who have not themselves transgressed? The theory of immediate imputation finds an all-sufficient answer in the one transgression of Adam as our federal head, whilst the opponents of that theory have no answer to give that can meet the requirements of the case. Their answer is, as the terms by which their theory is expressed indicate, that infants are regarded as sinners because they are subjectively sinful? This answer might be somewhat in point if the question were "Why are infants subjected to the penalty of temporal death"? It might be replied, with some appearance of cogency, that they die because they possess a corrupt nature. But this is not the question. The question is, "Why are children subjected to the penalty of spiritual death—to that innate corruption which is enmity against God, and is the most awful form of death of which a being formed in the image of God can be the subject?" To this question there can be no answer given which will vindicate the divine procedure from the charge of unrighteousness, except that which refers it, as the Scriptures do, to the disobedience of Adam as our covenant head.

Dr Forbes attempts a reply, as the mediate imputationists

are accustomed to do, by a reference of the moral corruption of infants to their natural relation to Adam. This might serve the purpose if the thing communicated were simply a natural, and not a moral and penal evil. But as the corruption in question is of this character, it must, as the very term penal implies, be legally and righteously inflicted, and this it cannot be except there has been a previous infraction of law. But as the law, whose penalty is inflicted on infants in the direful form of spiritual death, has not been broken by them, it must follow, if the infliction be righteous and not arbitrary, that it has been broken by one whose sin is reckoned to them. Here the mediate theory of imputation utterly fails, for it assumes, as the ground of the entire penalty, the foremost and direct element of the penalty itself. In a word, the penalty is the judicial ground of the penalty !

2. In the next place, it is manifest that the theory of Dr Forbes cannot be carried out in the case of Christ and his people. Here, also, there is a previous question to which the theory of mediate imputation can give no answer. That theory represents God as regarding the believer as righteous, on the ground of a righteousness previously infused. But herein is certainly a grave difficulty. If, on account of the sin of Adam, God, in righteousness, withdrew his life-giving presence and favour from the human race, how comes it that he can righteously draw nigh again to that righteously-abandoned race, and enter into communion with them once more, imparting to them the forfeited life ? The opponents of our author—and they are not Dr Hodge alone, but the entire Church of God—can answer this question by an appeal to the all-meritorious work and righteousness of Christ ; but the theory he advocates must remain silent when this question is raised, for it demands a subjective righteousness as the basis of the federal union between Christ and the sinner, thus ignoring the priority of the federal relation which alone can furnish any vindication of the divine procedure in entering into communion with the unholy, and imparting unto the ungodly the forfeited heritage of righteousness and life.

Even were it admitted that the infusion of some measure of righteousness vindicates the declaration made in justifying the ungodly, there is still demanded a vindication of the infusion itself. The governmental theory of Christ's work, which is Dr Forbes' theory, furnishes no adequate vindication of such infusion. That theory, as stated p. 164, is, "If God has said, 'the wages of sin is death,' death must follow in the administration of the divine government to the sinner, either in his own person or in that of a substitute ; otherwise God's truth is compromised, and the majesty of his law tarnished." Accord-

ing to this theory, the work of Christ was designed to vindicate the truth of God and his *rectoral* justice,—his justice as the Governor of the moral universe. The system, therefore, makes no provision for the vindication of the justice of God, considered as that *essential* attribute which demands that sin be punished for its own sake. The theory is right so far as it goes; but it is defective in its comprehension, as it does not recognise the *essential* antagonism of the *nature* of God to sin. As the claims of this attribute are not met by anything set forth in this theory of Christ's work, it, of course, follows that the theory furnishes no vindication of that act, or of that operation whereby righteousness is subjectively infused into the ungodly by him whose *nature* demands that the preceptive, as well as the penal, claims of his law be fully satisfied on their behalf. In a word, there is nothing to justify what God does in their case, beyond a demonstration of rectoral justice, whilst the thing done is morally impossible, apart from the satisfaction of the *preceptive* and *penal* claims of a law founded in the very nature of God himself.

The force and justice of these strictures will be all the more manifest, when it is considered that Dr Forbes's theory of imputation will not admit of the imputation of our sins to Christ. If, as he alleges, the thing imputed must have a subjective basis in those to whom it is reckoned, it were, of course, nothing short of blasphemy to speak of the imputation of sin to Christ. This charge is made, notwithstanding the statement of the doctrine of imputation made by our author in a note, p. 217, for the term imputation in that note must be regarded as used by him in the extended signification claimed for it, p. 110, (and attached to it throughout the entire commentary), where it is represented as referring, not simply to an external relation, but also to the inward subjective estate. Dr Forbes can say, as he does, p. 217, in perfect consistency with the theory that imputation demands a subjective estate of sin, or righteousness, that it is not their own righteousness that is imputed to believers, but the righteousness of Christ; for his doctrine, as developed in this work, is that Christ's righteousness is subjectively infused prior to, or simultaneously with, its imputation. The thing imputed must, according to our author, have a real subjective basis. There can be no doubt, therefore, that this theory of imputation demands, that before sin can be imputed to Christ, he must become the subject of it by a subjective infusion!

The remarks of our commentator on the text, "He hath made him to be sin for us," &c., (2 Cor. v. 21), pp. 138–41, give unmistakeable evidence of a conflict of spirit, arising out of his attachment to this theory of imputation and his reverence

for the Redeemer. On the one hand, he repudiates the idea that the great Substitute of sinners suffered any contamination from the transference of sin ; and on the other, he rejects the doctrine of a bare forensic imputation, and demurs to the doctrine which denies that Christ "was made sin" in a subjective sense. He expressly says, in answer to an opponent, "In the same sense, indeed, in which Christ was made sin for his people, they are made the righteousness of God in him. But in what sense is this? To the full extent, we believe, in both cases the transference was made of which the subjects of each were capable." Christ, he teaches, could come into as intimate connection with sin as he could with leprosy. On pp. 140-1, he uses the language: "By this expression, then, 'made sin for us,' more surely is meant than simply that our sin was *imputed* to Christ. It would evidently seem to denote that it affected him to the utmost extent that it was possible for a perfectly righteous being, 'who knew no sin,' to be affected ; that he became subject to every consequence (pollution alone excepted) which sin had entailed on our fallen race,—sorrow, pain, agony, and death ; nay, to that increased and intensified power of temptation which sin, by the fall, had acquired over our weakened nature ; since we are assured that he was 'tempted in *all* points like as we are,' that he might be able to give us the assurance and encouragement of his entire sympathy with us in our utmost weakness and trials."

As already intimated, these passages indicate a conflict of spirit. Dr Forbes wishes to hold by a theory of imputation which, to be consistent, demands, in the case of Christ, a subjective infusion of the thing imputed, and yet cannot brook the idea of such infusion. In the perplexity of the position into which he is brought by his theory, he endeavours to find out a middle ground, a doctrine of the transference of sin, which will mean more than a bare forensic imputation of the *reatus* of sin, and which yet will not mean so much as the transference of the *macula*. Here, however, he utterly fails. To this thing, which occupies a middle ground between the *guilt* and the corruption or pollution of sin, he has not ventured to give a name. He, however, has ventured to describe it, in the last clause of the last extract, as "that increased and intensified power of temptation which sin, by the fall, had acquired over our weakened nature." Wherein this weakness of nature consists, he does not venture to say. As, however, it is a weakness consequent upon the fall, and a weakness which peculiarly and intensely exposes to temptation, it is difficult to see wherein it differs from an actual and positive corrupt moral nature. As Protestant theologians cannot recognise a *vitium ad peccatum inclinans*, which is not *vere peccatum*, they can-

not admit the possibility of such an estate of weakness in the case of the adorable, immaculate Redeemer, as this passage unquestionably insinuates. In a word, this estate of weakness is either sinful, or it is not. If it is not an estate of sinfulness, it cannot serve as a support to the theory of imputation advocated in this book; for, according to this theory, neither sin nor righteousness can be imputed except on the basis of a corresponding subjective estate. To say that such a subjective estate was found in Christ, is simply to blaspheme. It is gratifying to find that Dr Forbes does not positively affirm the existence of this sinful estate; but it is painful to find one, whom it is impossible not to esteem for his Christian courtesy, verging so closely on a doctrine in regard to the personal moral estate of the Redeemer, which is simply subversive of Christianity. To such fearful alternative does this theory of mediate imputation of necessity lead. If neither sin nor righteousness can be imputed, except on the basis of an actual subjective existence, there can, of course, be no imputation of sin to Christ. If Adam's sin cannot be imputed to his posterity except on the ground of an actual subjective sinfulness, nor the righteousness of God, or of Christ, be imputed to his people except on the basis of an actual subjective impartation of it to them, it must follow that there can be no imputation of our sin to Christ except on the assumption of an actual transference of our sinfulness to him. Dr Forbes has manifestly felt that, in this instance, his theory of imputation is subjected to a crucial test, and has done his best to make it stand the trial. But he has utterly failed, and is compelled to deny and repudiate his own fundamental principle. Of what avail is all that he has said above, when he denies that sin was transferred to Christ so as to contaminate or pollute him? A subjective transference of sin—and Dr Forbes holds that even in the case of Christ there was such a transference!—a subjective transference of sin which does not contaminate and corrupt, is no transfer of sin in the sense of sinfulness. To speak of the transference of sinfulness, which does not make him to whom it is transferred sinful, is simply to use words without meaning. On this theory, then, there cannot, without blasphemy, be any such thing as an imputation of our sins to Christ. But apart from the imputation of sin to Christ, there is no atonement for sin, and no hope of pardon or acceptance for sinners. The theory of mediate imputation, therefore, is subversive of Christianity.

Such, and it is with pain the conclusion is stated, is the bearing of the central doctrines of this Analytical Commentary in regard to the work of Christ. But this is not all. Our author having advanced principles which are subversive of the work of Christ, proceeds to the advocacy of principles which are

utterly subversive of the work of the Holy Spirit. On this most important aspect of this commentary, there is not room to dwell. In proof of the charge, one or two sentences will be sufficient. On page 394, the following sketch, as opposed to the orthodox theodicy, occurs:—

“But admit, that involved in the very creation of responsible agents is the inalienable power of resisting God’s holy will, and continuing obstinately in that resistance in despite of every means used for their recovery, and all our most formidable difficulties vanish. We remove from God, and attribute wholly to the creature, the origin of evil—the limitation of the atonement—the ruin of lost souls—and the eternity and irreversibility, even by omnipotence itself, of the fearful doom of everlasting destruction which they bring upon themselves. We preserve intact all God’s perfections, and dissipate the dark cloud which rested on the sincerity of his professed desires and offers for the salvation of *all*, and on what he claims as the highest glory of his name and nature, the boundlessness of his mercy and love.”

The difficulty of the task of recovery, as sketched by Dr Forbes, is simply this:—

“To induce them, while their minds are still in their natural estate of aversion to holiness, to consent to God’s renewing their hearts, and reversing the corrupted bias of their wills, so as that they shall renounce all that they have hitherto so dearly loved.”

His doctrine is a combination of the moral suasion theory, with that of an omnipotent, miraculous renewing power:—

“It is a *moral*, not a miraculous power, which God puts forth in inducing sinners to consent to their spiritual cure, and to the rectification by his *miraculous* power of the perverted bias of their will, and the regeneration of their depraved nature. God’s miraculous power, like his physical, cannot be resisted. His moral power can, and alas! is resisted every day.”—(P. 395.)

The reader will not regard the foregoing as anything new. It is neither more nor less than the old theodicy, which refers the origin and continuance of moral evil to the freedom necessary to responsible agents. The reason why God permitted evil to enter the universe, or to continue in it, is to be found in the nature and conditions of free agency. It is therefore the creature which has determined the entrance of sin—the extent of the atonement—and the eternity of future punishment. God could not, without interfering with that freedom which is necessary to the responsibility of his creatures, have prevented the entrance of sin, nor can he, without infringing upon the prerogatives of free agency, remove it, now that it has entered, until he has obtained the consent of those who are the subjects of it. Such is the theory of our author in regard to free moral agency and its consequences, and it is hereby

pronounced utterly subversive of the sovereignty of God as the moral ruler of the universe, as it is subversive of the glory of his grace in the regeneration and final glorification of sinners. A being who sustains to the moral intelligences of the universe, the relation assumed in this theory, is neither the God, nor the governor of it. It is only discursively that he can know what the history of the universe shall be, and over its destinies he can have no control, except such as may be conceded to him by the workmanship of his own hands ! He may see the evil day coming, but he cannot prevent the dreaded disaster except by moral suasion or by the dethronement of a sovereign of his own creation ; and, rather than do this, he hands over to this uncontrollable autocrat the governmental reins of the entire empire of mind ! How refreshing is it to turn aside from the arrogance of such a theory, to the reverent humility and adoring awe of the apostle, who, after a review of the whole subject of the entrance and removal of sin, exclaims, "O the depths of the riches, both of the wisdom and the knowledge of God ; how unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out !" There let the origin of evil rest, and let no irreverent hand attempt to lift the veil from the unsearchable judgments, or inscrutable ways of a sovereign God.

It is, however, chiefly because of the bearing of this theory on the work of the Holy Spirit, that attention is here called to it. According to this theory, there is no influence except mere moral suasion, brought to bear upon the sinner in inducing him to consent to his spiritual cure, by the miraculous rectification of the perverted bias of his will, and the regeneration of his depraved nature. On this theory it is remarked,

1. That it is unscriptural. To consent to one's spiritual cure, is to consent unto the gospel. Such consent implies a sense of our sin and misery, and an apprehension of the remedy provided in Christ Jesus, and a full acquiescence in what the word of God alleges in regard to both. He who has such views of himself, and of "the things of the Spirit of God" as this implies, has been the subject of more than mere moral suasion. The Scriptures declare that no man in his natural estate can obtain such views of the things of the Spirit of God. Such things are spiritually discerned, and the natural man cannot receive them, nor know them. To all such things he is dead, and no mere moral suasion can awake him from that death-sleep, until it is broken by that voice which wakes the dead. Dr Forbes contradicts all this, by placing the change by which the soul is renovated, after the consent to the spiritual cure is obtained, by means of sheer moral suasion.

2. The theory is as unphilosophical as it is unscriptural.

The cure to which the man, in his assumed unregenerate estate is represented as consenting, is nothing less than the rectification of "the perverted bias of his will," and "the regeneration of his depraved nature." That is, the man consents to a thing against which his will has a bias, and against which his depraved nature revolts, whilst the bias and the depravity remain unchanged! This may be a species of philosophy, but it is certainly not the philosophy either of Scripture or common sense. It would certainly be interesting to know under what division of the phenomena of the soul, Dr Forbes would place "*consent*." Is it a cognition, or is it a feeling consequent upon a cognition, or is it a conation consequent upon both? If, as is manifest, it must come under the head of "conations," the question arises, How comes it into existence in opposition to "a depraved nature," and "the perverted bias of the will"? Must not the conations be as the feelings are, and the feelings be as the nature is? Can a moral agent, with a depraved nature, have feelings such as a holy being alone can have? or can a being, possessing only such feelings as belong to a depraved nature, experience desires which are at war with such feelings, and urge him to seek their extirpation?

Nor are we to tarry in our inquiry with the feelings and conations. As the soul is a unit, the moral virus which affects it in one of its powers, must affect it in all. The soul is not a series of sensations or exercises, nor is it a congeries of independent faculties. It is a spiritual essence, endowed with attributes through which it reveals itself. The faculties of the soul, therefore, cannot be affected for good or evil, as isolated entities. The whole powers of the soul are the heirs, in their respective spheres, of the evil or the good. There can, therefore, be no such thing as "a depraved nature" and a spiritual understanding, or a will with "a perverted bias," where there are, nevertheless, unobscured cognitive powers. In a word, there can be no moral suasion where there is "a depraved nature," or "a perverted will."

This indissoluble connection of the powers of the soul is recognised in the Scriptures, which speak of the thoughts and the understanding of the heart, and which recognise no moral feeling apart from an intellectual apprehension of the object to which the feeling is correlative, or moral apprehension apart from a corresponding subjective feeling. And in conformity with all this, is the Scripture doctrine of spiritual illumination. The eyes of the understanding are enlightened, and the heart is opened to apprehend the truth. The renewal which the sinner undergoes, is not simply a renewal of his will, or of a depravity which does not reach to, or affect his understanding, but one which enlightens the eyes, removes the veil from the

heart, and renews the man in *knowledge*, after the image of him that created him. Thus it is manifest, that this theory, which places moral suasion prior to spiritual renovation, is both anti-scriptural and anti-psychological.

3. But in addition to all this, the theory is suicidal. It assumes that God could not preserve a holy free moral agent from sin, without destroying his freedom, and yet teaches that he can restore fallen free moral agents to holiness, without infringing upon the prerogatives of free agency! How can a man hold in his mind, at the same time, principles which are so manifestly at war with each other? And the man who holds this theory, comprising these antagonistic elements, let it be observed, admits that the only difficulty in the way, either of the preservation in holiness, or of the restoration to it, is the obtaining of the consent of the free agent concerned! The agent can be subjected to the operation of a "miraculous power" (this is Dr Forbes' term), that is, a power which operates, not in accordance with the laws of his nature, and yet remain free, provided only that his consent be obtained prior to the forth-putting of this power upon him. If so, does not the question arise, and is it not the sole question at issue, "Could not the consent of a holy being be as easily obtained to the undergoing of an operation which would preserve him in holiness, as the consent of an unholy being to an operation which is designed to restore him to holiness"? Can any intelligent moral being hesitate to say, that the difficulty lies entirely within the conditions of the latter case? To affirm that a holy being would refuse consent to an operation proposed by a holy God, the effect of which would be his confirmation in holiness, is simply to say that he has no love for holiness, or for the perpetuation of a holy estate, which is all one with saying that he is unholy. In the other case, however, as has been already shown, the obtaining of consent by mere moral suasion to an operation, whose avowed end and aim are utterly repulsive to him to whom it is proposed, is altogether impossible. Dr Forbes' theodicy, therefore, contains the premises of an *a fortiori* argument against his own theory of the origin of evil; for it teaches that an unholy free moral agent can, by the mere influence of moral suasion, be induced to consent to his restoration to holiness. If so, his opponents can triumphantly reply, *much more* may a holy being be induced to consent to his preservation in a holy estate. And if so, it of course follows, even on our author's own showing, that sin could have been prevented without any infraction of the rights or prerogatives of free moral agents. In a word, it follows, that the solution of the insolvable problem of the origin of evil is not to be found in the conditions of free agency.

It is painful to be under the necessity of uttering a wholesale condemnation of a work which evinces much scholarly refinement, and which has unquestionably cost its author much thought and labour; but the interests of truth demand such a verdict. It is utterly wrong in its philosophy, and false in its distinctive theology. In its fundamental principles, it is subversive of the work of Christ, and irreconcilable with the Scripture doctrine in regard to the office and work of the Holy Ghost. R. W.

ART. III.—*The Norwegian Church.*

HAVING lately spent some time very pleasantly in Norway, we eagerly embraced the opportunity of inquiring into the constitution and actual condition of its national church. Since our return to this country, we have continued these studies with the aid of such books, in English or Norsk, as were within our reach, and now give the result.

The Norwegians are almost our nearest neighbours, and are in many important respects more like us (especially the Scotch) than are any other continentals. We trust, therefore, that these notices will be found somewhat interesting, especially at a moment when a considerable body of the English clergy is endeavouring to bring about intercommunion between their own church and that of Norway.

Norway and Sweden, though forming one realm under the same sovereign, are merely confederated, not amalgamated. Sweden has an altogether aristocratic government, whereas Norway is essentially a democracy, in which the mass of influence rests with small allodial proprietors, who, as they love to express it, hold their land "free and by, at least, as good a title as that by which the king holds his crown." Each country has its own flag, laws, and local management, and jealously maintains its own absolute independence in all such matters. Hence a knowledge of the church in Sweden gives one no idea of the state of things in Norway, and *vice versa*.

The Norsk Church is Lutheran, consequently episcopal, but, as will be seen from what follows, the bishops are regarded rather as clergymen having a higher status as civil officials, than as possessing, in virtue of their office, more exalted spiritual powers than those inherent in the ordinary clergy. In fact, Motzfeldt, in his standard work on the subject, lays it down as an axiom, that the church of Norway is a mere department of the state, like the military and civil services; consequently, like them, altogether under the control of the crown.

The services being essentially ceremonial, crosses, and embroidered vestments, and candles upon the (so-called) altars, are in universal use; every pastor is a "priest," the communion service is "the mass," and the surplice is a "mass shirt."

There are no archbishops, and the whole country is divided into six sees; in 1844 there were 53 rural deans, and about 350 distinct parishes; these numbers vary, however, continually, according to the arrangements of government, and the changing circumstances of the country.

The bishops are nominated by the archdeacons and rural deans of Norway, subject to the approval of the crown, as conveyed through the ecclesiastical department of the state.

There is, in the ritual, a special service for the "setting apart," it can scarcely be called "the consecration," of a bishop; he receives the imposition of the hands of another bishop, and of at least five simple pastors of the diocese. Each bishop on appointment receives a golden cross from the sovereign, and (as in the case of ordination of a pastor) the "right hand of fellowship" from the officiating bishop.

Bishops cease to be pastors of particular parishes, and do not, as a rule, preach regularly; they are, however, required annually to visit as many deans' districts as they can overtake, and at the close of each year, to report minutely to government on all subjects brought to their notice, during their own visitations or those of their deans.

The pay of the bishop is, considering the ruling rates of expenses, good,—about five or six hundred a-year, with residence, or allowance in lieu thereof; and when incapacitated by age or illness, they can retire upon a pension equivalent to a third or a half of the full pay; provision is also made by the crown for their widows, but not for their children.

The bishop has no council under any name, but the arch-deacon (Stifts Provst), who is appointed by himself, is his assistant, and confidential adviser, and ordinary medium of communication with the clergy of the diocese.

The arch-deacon acts for the bishop when the latter is absent, and performs, as occasion requires, all the functions of an interim bishop; for example, he can, in such case, take the part of the bishop in consecration of other bishops, and so on.

The rural dean (Provst paa Landet) is selected by the bishop and pastors of the district,—the former having, as his sole prerogative in the matter, a double vote,—his appointment, like that of all other officials, must be confirmed by the crown, and, like them, he is not removeable except by judgment of a court of law. The rural dean is inaugurated at a meeting of the bishop and clergy, after an exhortation in Latin, and after

making oath to perform his new duties faithfully. He remains pastor of his old church, but is bound to make periodical visitations of the various congregations in his district, and to send to his bishop, before the close of September in each year, copies of the notes taken by him during these circuits, and during those made in company of his bishop. These minutes must contain full information as to the actual state of the churches, parsonages, and glebes, intelligence and fitness of schoolmasters, condition of the poor, conduct of the clergy, &c., &c. ; and it is particularly enjoined that each congregation shall be visited by the dean alone, or by the dean and the bishop in company, at least once in three years.

A rural dean has the oversight of from five to fifteen parishes, and a bishop has about as many deans under him.

As to the ordinary clergy, they are usually sons of priests or of other officials, very rarely indeed are they sprung from the "bonder" (peasant) class.

There is but one university and but one "divinity hall," as it would be called in Scotland ; it is at Christiania, at the very south of the peninsula, and on this and other accounts, the establishment of a second at Trondheim has been urged.

All lads who are intended for the university study beforehand at grammar schools, and in applying for matriculation, must produce a certificate of competency from the rector, and then pass a preliminary examination. We understand that if an applicant fails to pass, the person who recommended him is liable to punishment. About eighteen months after matriculation, a second examination is held, and those who pass this test, then branch off to their special studies of law, medicine, theology, &c. In what may be called "the divinity hall" the students remain about four and a half years, and then go up for a final examination, which occupies seven days (one *viva voce*, six with written papers). The examinations are carried on by four professors, and embrace Latin, Greek, mathematics, &c. It may in passing be mentioned, that students do not pay any fees for their classes.

On passing the final examination, the student, without further ceremony, becomes a "candidate of theology," (equivalent to a preacher in Scotland), and, in ordinary cases, remains for some years a schoolmaster or a curate. Owing to the great extent of the landward parishes, and the difficulties of communication in so wild a country, most of the pastors have two, three, or more churches in different glens, where service is held in rotation : frequently curates take charge of one or more of these outlying congregations, which are, in fact, "chapels of ease."

As lads do not go up to the university until they are seven-

teen or so, and as the course of study there is long, one may presume (and we think facts quite justify the presumption) that the pastors of Norway are a well-educated set of men, who in general knowledge are quite up to the par of the clergy in other countries. Further, as the pay of the pastors is proportionally high, they hold a prominent position in the community; and as they are in all, save spiritual matters, identified with the people,—being, for instance, eligible and often chosen as representatives in the National Parliament (Stor Thing),—their influence is very considerable.

When a vacancy occurs in the Church, the candidates, curates, and pastors, who desire the living, apply to the Clerical Department of State in Christiania, the chief of which may or may not be himself a clergyman. The Department recommends three of the applicants, of whom one is appointed by Government, all lay patronage having been abolished.

It has hitherto been usual to give each pastor, as his first cure of souls, some remote country parish, and then by degrees, if found deserving, to bring him down to the larger towns. There is, however, a strong and well-founded feeling against the system, partly because it causes too frequent removals among the clergy, and partly because it causes to them great waste of time and labour, by forcing them to acquire a knowledge of dialects which are confined to small districts.

No candidate is ordained until a living has been secured for him: hence the spectacle of clergymen wandering about in search of employment, lamentably common in England, is unknown in Norway.

Ordinations of pastors must be celebrated on Wednesday or Friday by the bishop, (or, in his absence, by the archdeacon), and at least five pastors of the diocese.

The bishop (or archdeacon) alone gives the right hand of fellowship, but the bishop and pastors join in the imposition of hands. It seems to be admitted that the crown might, by special commission, direct any simple pastor to execute, at an ordination, all the functions of a bishop, but we are not aware that a case in point has occurred.

As previously mentioned, in country parts each pastor has usually several separate congregations in different glens: at each such preaching-station or chapel of ease, he has three or more assistants (*med hjælpere*). These men by no means occupy the position of the Presbyterian "elder." They are selected by the clergyman, who is, however, bound to report his choice to the bishop and sheriff (*stifts amtmand*); and these officials are believed to possess a veto upon the appointment.

These assistants appear to have no power whatever. They are supposed to know the characters of the parishioners, and thus to be capable of aiding the pastor in the duty of admitting to, or debarring from, the Lord's Supper : this is all. There is not even, so far as we are aware, any particular name for that court, or council, formed by a pastor and his assistants, and which is the unit of the Presbyterian system. From what precedes, it is evident that no ceremony approaching to consecration or ordination is applied to these men.

It appears, then, that in the Norwegian Church there is but one grade among the clergy—namely, the simple pastor. The elder is altogether a layman, the candidate is still a layman, the rural dean, archdeacon, and bishop are mere superintending pastors, appointed by the State, and not performing one single function which may not, under certain circumstances, be performed by a simple pastor. Thus a pastor may act as rural dean ; and even, if he be appointed to the substantive office, he is not regarded as in any way raised above other clergymen, except in this, that he has now entrusted to him the duty of reporting to Government, through his bishop, on all matters occurring in his district which affect religion, education, &c. The archdeacon, again, is little more than the bishop's private secretary ; and the bishop himself is merely the clergyman who forms the direct medium of communication between the Church and the Crown, but who, in all spiritual matters, may be replaced by a simple pastor.

Charges against a pastor are brought, in the first instance, before the rural dean and two clergymen of his district, and an appeal lies to the Consistorial Court, which consists of the bishop, of two pastors appointed for the occasion by the bishop, and of two lawyers who, with the bishop, are permanent members : the ultimate appeal is to the Supreme Civil Court in Christiania.

As to the support of the clergy, it is on a liberal scale. Each has a house and glebe, consisting of one or more farms, with grazing ground up the mountain ; and, besides this, receives from each farm in the parish, a certain amount of oats, barley rye, butter, fish, skins, &c. (according to locality). These are delivered in kind at each preaching-station, on a day previously notified from the pulpit, and are disposed of by the pastor as occasion offers. It is manifest that this custom, involving as it does clergymen and parishioners in trading transactions, in which their several interests are directly opposed, is most objectionable ; and we understand that in some parts of the country the great reform of commuting these dues into money payments has been introduced.

The clergyman is further legally entitled to fees on various

occasions; for instance, in country parishes he gets, for each marriage among his parishioners, from thirteen to six-and-thirty shillings (English); for a baptism, from sevenpence to three shillings; for a funeral or confirmation, from one to thirteen shillings, and so on. The fees are, of course, considerably higher in towns, and are often materially increased as ostentation or goodwill prompts. Occasionally the enforcement of these fees gives rise to a good deal of dissatisfaction; for instance, in the case of a man who, living in one parish, is married at the church of a second to a woman resident in a third, and finds to his disgust that he has to pay all the three priests. Further, the pastors receive considerable additions to their incomes from the voluntary offerings of the people at Easter, &c.

Pastors have no legal right to pension, but such is, under ordinary circumstances, always granted in case of incapacity from old age or sickness, and is usually about equal to half of the full pay. We understand that all officials, clerical or lay, are obliged to subscribe to a pension fund.

The provision made for clergymen's widows consists of certain farms,—one in each parish,—of which they enjoy the use during life. It was found, however, that the widows, unable to work their farms profitably, or to obtain in the country educational advantages for their children, leased the lands and flocked to the towns. The ancient system is, therefore, being abandoned, the widows' farms are sold, and the proceeds added to a fund, from which are paid pensions, amounting to twenty-seven pounds per annum, or more, according to the exigency of the case.

When, from increase of population, it is found necessary to sub-divide a parish, the necessary funds are obtained from "the General Enlightenment Fund," (*Oplysnings Kasse*), which took its rise mainly from the sale of lands dedicated to the Church in Roman Catholic times.

Besides the regular dues from farms for up-keep of church and school buildings, almost every parish derives benefit from particular offerings made in by-gone ages. Thus one will have a tract of forest dedicated in the hope and trust that thereby a particular farm would be saved from lightning; another is kept well supplied with candles by a farm, which is so situated as to be in danger of destruction from land-slips or avalanches, and so on.

The Church service is entirely Lutheran, and the only catechism in use is Luther's.

Confirmation acts a most important part in the civil administration of the country; it is in fact used as a ready test of education, intelligence, and adolescence. Thus, no one can give evidence upon oath, or marry, or be apprenticed to a trade until confirmed. This system leads to so much which is

more than objectionable, that strong efforts are being made to bring about a change in the law. Children are seldom confirmed under the age of fifteen, and for about a year before hand (including, however, in many places a long winter interruption of from three to six months) are instructed at regular intervals by their pastor, who as text-book uses a work by the celebrated Bishop Pontoppidan (Pontoppidan's Forklaring).

Sunday schools, such as are universal throughout Britain, are quite unknown, at least in the country parts of Norway; the schools open on that day being for the teaching of the ordinary branches of education. Hence the young people receive little, if any, systematic instruction on religious subjects until they attend these classes. Each pastor confirms the children of his own parish on the first Sunday after Easter; this tends to prove what was stated above, namely, that in spiritual matters there is but one grade in the Norwegian Church.

The administration of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper occurs usually twice a year in the country, and almost every Sunday in towns. Young people do not receive the sacrament immediately after being confirmed, but are expected to do so at the next ordinary celebration of the rite. In rural districts all, or nearly all, adults partake of the Lord's Supper at least once a year; in fact a man would be looked upon with some suspicion who was lax in this matter; hence the sexes attend in about equal proportion.

Any clergyman may, upon good cause shewn, refuse the sacrament to an applicant; in ordinary cases an appeal would lie to the rural dean, and from him to the bishop, but no further. Should a pastor, however, have acted harshly and imprudently,—should he, for instance, without previous warning have passed over a man then and there kneeling at the "altar," it seems that a civil action for injury to character would lie.

It is customary for those who wish to partake of the sacrament to intimate their desire a few days before to the clerk, or else to one of the "elders." If the clerk or any of the elders know that an applicant is living in any open sin, they bring the matter to the notice of the clergyman, who, after exhortation and reproof, deals with the case as to him seems good.

As to ordinary observances at the celebration of the sacrament of the supper, in some parts husbands and wives kneel side by side around the altar rails; in others the men are on the right, the women on the left (this is the form prescribed by the authorised ritual); and in others the men of mature age, the young men, the matrons, and the girls succeed in the order given.

The Norwegian Church, being Lutheran, of course believes in consubstantiation; hence the consecrated elements are not

only treated with extreme reverence by the priest, but are not taken into the hands of the laity at all. The bread is prepared in the form of unleavened wafers, one of which is placed, by the pastor, in the mouth of the kneeling parishioner, and the chalice is held to the lips by the priest.

We cannot say positively whether the reception of this sacrament is regarded in a superstitious light, as a sort of charm to whitewash one from past sins, and as a passport to give one a happy entrance into the other world, but assuredly the private household administration of the rite is exceedingly common, and we understand that a clergyman is civilly answerable if he does not in such a case forthwith answer the call of a parishioner, be it by day or by night. It is not unusual also for bedridden people in no immediate danger to require their pastor to administer to them this rite at their own houses ; and on such occasions it is not necessary that any one, save the invalid and the priest, be present.

Should any of the elements remain over unused, they are kept for the next celebration.

Owing to the view taken of the extreme necessity of baptism, this sacrament is very commonly administered immediately after birth by any adult male or female who is present. Should the child, however, live, it must be brought to the church, where the appropriate service (excepting only the actual formula) is read, the clergyman's hands placed as usual upon its head, and—the pastor's fee paid. I find that, according to the regulations, each child should have not more than five sponsors, of whom three are to be of its own sex ; but I believe that this number is frequently exceeded.

Marriage is invariably celebrated in church, either on Sunday or upon a week day ; but of late there is a general desire to confine it to the latter, and so to avoid that desecration of the holy day which has hitherto been too common. In the country, marriages are frequently carried out much in the fashion of the old Scottish penny weddings, and this leads to so much dissipation, that many of the clergy are bestirring themselves to bring about a better state of things. The couple to be married must, of course, have been confirmed, and must have partaken of the Lord's Supper. The publication of banns is much the same as with us : no ring is used at the ceremony, and the women do not afterwards habitually wear that which is given on engagement.

Betrothal takes place in presence of the priest and friends, either at the parsonage or at the house of one of the parties.

We understand that an effort,—which is of course opposed by the church,—is being made to declare mere civil marriage, as also the marriage of divorced persons, legal.

The church service books are two in number : first, the Altar Book, which contains the collects, gospels, epistles, and authorised prayers to be used on particular occasions ; and secondly, the Ritual, which gives full directions for the ordinary services. Neither of these, however, seems to be much in the hands of the laity, who content themselves with a volume containing the gospels, epistles, and one of the three authorised sets of hymns ; and, from what we observed, we very much fear that this book to a great extent takes the place of the whole Word of God, an effect which many years ago was pointed out by the clergy of Scotland as likely to follow the publication of a selection of Bible extracts to be read in churches.

On ordinary occasions, during public worship on Sundays, several of the prayers are of the clergyman's own composition, sometimes extemporaneous, sometimes (as is also usually the case with sermons) written out and repeated, so far at least as the former are concerned, month after month with little if any change.

In concluding these brief notes, we add a few miscellaneous remarks which may be found more or less interesting.

In accordance with eastern custom, the Norwegians, like the Scots of ancient days, reckon Sunday from six o'clock on the evening of Saturday ; the system may be primitive, but assuredly it does not answer practically.* A man when out fishing on the Fjord (sea-loch) upon Saturday evening is almost sure not to come home till the Sunday has commenced, and then on the following day, after attending service, he begins early in the afternoon to think of the evening's work or sport.

As previously stated, Sunday schools, as the term is understood by us, are quite unknown in the country parts of Norway ; the same may be said of prayer meetings ; in fact, the only societies connected with religion in which the peasants are interested, are parochial missionary meetings, at which, after a short prayer and exposition, some account of the doings of Danish or Norwegian missionaries in foreign lands is read aloud. At these meetings any one selected by the members then present conducts the proceedings ; if the pastor has shewn himself interested in the matter and is present, he will in general be appointed.

The clergy have no stated periodical meetings sanctioned by the Government. They do occasionally assemble, in considerable numbers, at missionary festivals ; but such gatherings are not recognised by the State, have no legal existence, and their

* In 1640, the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland ruled that Sunday was to commence at, and close at, midnight : previously it had been reckoned from sunset to sunset.

decisions have no weight whatever. The pastors accordingly do not seem, on the whole, to be so well acquainted with what is going on in the religious world (even of their own country) as is desirable,—a fact which will not appear surprising when we state that there is but a single religious magazine which has any circulation. All this is sure occasionally to induce a certain amount of sleepiness on the part of the clergy, some of whom are, however, doing what they can to bring about a salutary reform in this and other respects.

In Norway there is the most perfect liberty of conscience, and of the press; one may preach, or teach, or say, or print anything he pleases, so long as he does not offend good morals, or infringe upon the civil rights of his neighbours. Proselytism is, however, regarded as an injury for which the Courts of Law will award damages; and by proselytism is understood unbidden intrusion into the houses of others, or the abuse of an official position—such as that of schoolmaster—for the purpose of leading the young astray from their national faith.

In spite of this freedom, the number of dissenters is extremely, surprisingly small, being almost wholly confined to a little society of Quakers at Stavanger, and a few Roman Catholics in one or two of the larger towns.

About the close of last century, Hans Nielsen Hauge obtained a considerable number of adherents, who however continued to be obedient members of the Established Church, and seem to have been distinguished from others only by increased earnestness and spirituality in religious matters. They formed, in fact, the evangelical portion of the church, and a few disorders which broke out among them here and there, may be ascribed rather to the ignorance in which they had been brought up, than to anything wrong in the views of the new party. As a distinct sect, the Haugianers have, we believe, disappeared, but the general tendency of the church seems at this moment to be from rationalism to evangelical truth and earnestness.

In the “Fundamental Law” or “Constitution” of Norway, the only notices of religion are as follows:—

“The public religion of the State shall be the ‘Evangelic Lutheran;’ subjects belonging to it are bound to bring up their children in that faith.

“Jesuits and monks are not tolerated, and Jews are not permitted to enter the country” (this latter restriction has, we believe, been removed). “The king must belong to the Established Church, and support it.”

Again, in the Statute of 20th August 1842, it is laid down, that “if any one ridicules God’s Holy Word or Sacraments, or mocks the established religion, he shall be liable to fine

or imprisonment; but if such be done in print, he shall be liable to imprisonment, with or without hard labour, in the fifth degree, that is, for from six months to three years.

Our task is done, its object being simply to ascertain and to record facts; the drawing of deductions is left to others.

As to the ordinary and extraordinary services, formularies, &c., these possess a considerable degree of interest, but to insert notices of them here, would extend this paper to an unreasonable length.

A. O. B.

ART. IV.—*Philo Judæus.*

Philonis Judæi Opera quæ reperi potuerunt omnia, THOMAS MANGHEY, S.T.P. Canonicus Dunelinensis. London. 1742.*

The Works of Philo Judæus, the Contemporary of Josephus. Translated from the Greek. By C. D. YONGE, B.A. 4 Vols. London: Henry G. Bohn, York Street, Covent Garden. 1854-5.*

IN one point of view, greater interest attaches to Philo than can be claimed even for the Jewish historian Josephus; inasmuch as the former was—what the latter was not—a contemporary of the blessed Saviour. Speaking of himself, Josephus says, “As was I born to Matthias, in the first year of the reign of Caius Cæsar.”—(Life, § 1.) Caius, better known as Caligula, ascended the Roman throne in A.D. 37, or about eight years after the date generally assigned to the crucifixion. Consequently, Josephus did not come into the world till eight years after the death of Christ. The date of Philo’s birth it is impossible to fix with certainty. When the Alexandrian Jews sent an embassy to Caligula, in or about the year A.D. 40, Philo, who was one of the ambassadors, could use this language of himself and his colleagues: “But I myself, who was accounted to be possessed of superior prudence, both *on account of my age* and my education” (Philo’s Works, Yonge’s Translation,* vol. iv., p. 140). One whose years could thus inspire respect, was probably not much, if at all, under sixty. Assuming this

* Mangey’s Greek and Latin edition of Philo, consists of two ponderous folio volumes, with the Greek type and contractions so much in vogue during last century. Yonge’s translation, published as part of Bohn’s excellent “Ecclesiastical Library,” and which seems accurate in the parts of it which we have examined, constitutes four thick volumes, of convenient octavo size, extremely well worth the notice of theological students. It is from Yonge’s translation that we have taken the extracts embodied in the present article.

to have been his age, then he must have been born B.C. 20, been a youth of sixteen at the time of the Saviour's advent, a man of forty-nine at the crucifixion, and fifty-seven when Josephus first saw the light. Every one must instinctively perceive the deep interest attaching to a first-rate Jewish writer who lived during the entire period that the Divine Redeemer was upon earth.

Unhappily, however, the place of Philo's residence was not Jerusalem, or even Palestine, but Alexandria. Ever since the establishment of the Ptolemy dynasty in Egypt, in the era immediately succeeding that of Alexander the Great, the Jews had swarmed into that fertile country, and they now constituted a very large part of the inhabitants resident in its capital, Alexandria, which, at the commencement of the Christian era, was second only to Rome in population, in wealth, and in importance. They and their Jewish fellow-citizens were almost perpetually at variance, the obvious cause being their widely diverse faiths. When then, just after the commencement of the Emperor Caligula's reign, the Jews of Alexandria were being subjected to such grievous persecution at the hands of their Greek fellow-citizens, headed by the Roman governor, that it was found necessary to send an embassy to Caligula on the subject, Philo was the chief of the Jewish representatives. Apion, the vile accuser of the Jews, against whom it will be remembered that the historian Josephus wrote a most learned treatise, was the chief man of a counter embassy, dispatched by the Alexandrian Greeks. The mission of Philo and his companions had soon to be extended to an object more important than that of the persecution at Alexandria—namely to implore the earthly master of the Roman world not to insult God and drive the Jews into revolt, by requiring his own statue to be erected in the temple at Jerusalem. The most earnest endeavours on the part of the Jewish delegates failed to restrain the imperious Caligula, whose reason was all but overthrown through the indulgence of insensate pride; but at length the assassination of the tyrant, by a few people out of the many on whom he had trampled, warded off the dangers which had so greatly menaced the worshippers at Jerusalem. Speaking of the series of historical transactions now described, Josephus terms Philo "the principal of the Jewish embassy, a man eminent on all accounts, brother to Alexander the alabarch, and one not unskilful in philosophy" (*Antiq.*, book xviii., chap. xviii., § 1). On this Whiston has the following note:—"This Alexander the alabarch, or governor of the Jews at Alexandria, and brother to Philo, is supposed, by Bishop Pearson, in 'Act Apost,' pp. 41-42, to be the same with that Alexander who is mentioned by St Luke, as of the kindred of the high priests" (*Acts*

iv. 6). If this supposition be correct, and there is nothing improbable in it, then it will be seen how nearly Philo is connected with Bible history.

Philo was a married man, and seems to have obtained in his wife one who appreciated him at his proper worth; for, in a fragment of one of his last works, preserved by Antonius, the following paragraph occurs:—

“When once the wife of Philo was asked, in an assembly of many women, why she alone of all her sex did not wear any golden ornaments, she replied, “The virtue of a husband is a sufficient ornament for his wife.”—(IV., 275.)

In the brief memoir of Philo, prefixed to Yonge’s translation, it is stated that his (Philo’s) “son [Tiberius Alexander] married Berenice, the daughter of King Agrippa.” We do not know the authority for the statement, and doubt its accuracy in two particulars. First, regarding the relationship of Tiberius Alexander to Philo, Josephus says, “Then came Tiberius Alexander as successor to Fadus; he was the son of Alexander the alabarch, of Alexandria” (*Joseph. Antiq.*, book xx, chap. v., § 2). Next, as to his marriage with Berenice, the daughter of King Agrippa. Among the list of her marriages, there does not anywhere, that we have seen, occur one with Tiberius Alexander.

Our author speaks of having visited Jerusalem, saying, “at the time when I was on my journey towards the temple of my native land, for the purpose of offering up prayers and sacrifices therein” (iv., 240). He once employs the phrase, “We poor men” (iii. 260). He used often to visit the theatre (i. 489). The time of his death is unknown.

These are the leading facts which can be educed from a study of his works, and those of his successor and compeer Josephus; and now, we would follow the same plan as in the article treating of the last-named writer, in investigating the character of Philo, and the leading features of his writings.

And first, it is needful to attempt tracing out his physical temperament. To enable us to form some conception of this, it is requisite that, if possible, we reason out his bodily from his mental characteristics.

The tendency to reflection was so strongly developed within him, that at times, and, we suspect, generally, it almost incapacitated him for proper observation, even when he had visited a place of interest with the express design of acquiring knowledge.

“Moreover, not only they who were in the desert were bitten by serpents, but also they who were scattered abroad; for I, also, often having left the men, who were my kinsmen and my friends, and my

country, and having gone into the desert, in order that I might perceive some of those things which are worthy of being beheld, have profited nothing. But my mind, being separated from me, or being bitten by passion, has withdrawn towards the things opposite to them. And there are times when, in the midst of a multitude composed of infinite numbers of men, I can bring my mind into solitude, God having scattered for me the crowd which perplexed my soul; and having taught me that it is not the difference of place that is the cause of good and evil, but rather God, who moves and drives the vehicle of the soul wherever he pleases."—(I. 101.)

It will be perceived, from the foregoing extract, that Philo possessed great power of abstraction, so that in the midst of a multitude he could become unconscious that any one was present, and pursue his thoughts undisturbed by the din around. So far as our observation of life has extended, this power goes with a peculiar temperament. It is not generally associated with physical strength. The tendency of strong muscles and nerves of iron is towards athletic sports; or, if there be a combination of physical strength with mental ability, it is to observation of nature or of life—it is not to absence of mind or reflection. The opposite temperament, that attended with a greater or lesser measure of bodily weakness, combined with great mental strength or subtilty, whether occurring in man or in woman, leans towards genius; and the whole tendencies of Philo, and the well-pronounced characteristics of his writings, shew him to have received this great gift.

Partly from the sensitiveness of his organisation, which made him feel more acutely, than one of coarser make would have done, the shocks which those engaged in public duty are sure to a greater or less extent to encounter, but chiefly from the consuming desire he felt to amass knowledge, and prosecute the search after truth, he lived much in seclusion.

But, as his reputation increased, the Jewish community more and more broke in upon his retirement, to make him, if possible, take an active part in political affairs, with the result of calling forth this characteristic lament:—

“At that time, therefore, looking down from above, from the air, and straining the eye of my mind as from a watch-tower, I surveyed the unspeakable contemplation of all the things on the earth, and looked upon myself as happy, as having forcibly escaped from all the evil fates that can attack human life. Nevertheless, the most grievous of all evils was lying in wait for me—namely, envy, that hates everything that is good, and which, suddenly attacking me, did not cease from dragging me after it by force till it had taken me and thrown me into the vast sea of the cares of public politics, in which I was, and still am, tossed about, without being able to keep myself swimming on the top. But, though I groan at my fall, I still hold out and resist,

retaining in my soul that desire of instruction which has been implanted in it from my earliest youth ; and this desire, taking pity and compassion on me, raises me up and alleviates my sorrow. And it is through this fondness for learning that I at times lift up my head, and with the eyes of my soul, which are indeed dim (for the most of affairs, wholly inconsistent with their proper objects, has overshadowed their acute clear-sightedness), still, as well as I may, I survey all things around me, being eager to imbibe something of a life which shall be pure and unalloyed by evils.

And if at any time unexpectedly there shall arise a brief period of tranquillity, and a short calm and respite from the troubles which arise from State affairs, I then rise aloft and float above the troubled waves, soaring, as it were, in the air, and being, I may almost say, blown forward by the breezes of knowledge, which often persuades me to flee away and pass all my days with her, escaping, as it were from my pitiless masters, not men only, but also affairs which pour upon me from all quarters and at all times like a torrent."—(III. 804.)

No one who had the temperament for action could have viewed the matter in this way. He was evidently designed for literary seclusion, not for active life.

Like other people possessed of the student-temperament, he found his ability for composition greatly vary at different times. There were periods when, put forth what effort he might, his mind was barren of ideas ; while there were seasons at which, when the proper afflatus exerted its full influence on his soul, his productive power was so great that he felt almost as if inspired. He speaks thus himself upon the subject :—

"I am not ashamed to relate what has happened to me myself, which I know from having experienced it ten thousand times. Sometimes, when I have desired to come to my usual employment of writing on the doctrine of philosophy, though I have known accurately what it was proper to set down, I have found my mind barren and unproductive, and have been completely unsuccessful in my object, being indignant at my mind for the uncertainty and vanity of its then existing opinions, and filled with amazement at the power of the living God, by whom the womb of the soul is at times opened, and at times closed up ; and sometimes, when I have come to my work empty, I have suddenly become full, ideas being, in an invisible manner, showered upon me, and implanted in me from on high ; so that, through the influence of divine inspiration, I have become greatly excited, and have known neither the place in which I was, nor those who were present, nor myself, nor what I was saying, nor what I was writing ; for then I have been conscious of a richness of interpretation, an enjoyment of light, a most penetrating sight, a most manifest energy, in all that was to be done, having such an effect on my mind as the cleared ocular demonstration would have on the eyes."—(I. 50 ; see also I. 182.)

We pass next to the consideration of HIS MENTAL CHARACTERISTICS. No one sets himself to study as Philo did, unless his intellectual ability be much above average; and that our author's powers were very great is put beyond question, by the remarkable attainments in knowledge that he made.

His acquaintance with the literature of Greece was extensive. He quotes Solon and Lycurgus, the great lawgivers of that country. Among the bards, he often refers to Homer, whom in one place (ii. 2) he terms "the greatest and most glorious of all poets;" Hesiod, Sophocles, Æschylus, Euripides, and others. He makes allusion to Xenophon and his brother historians. He refers to the tenets of the various philosophers, as for instance, Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, Zeno, Democritus, Epicurus, the Stoics, &c. Plato seems to have excited his special admiration, and exerted no slight influence on the general current of his thoughts and language. There are parts of Philo which irresistibly recall the *Timæus* of Plato, which is indeed specially quoted oftener than once, while there is a passage (iii. 509) in which Plato is termed "the sweetest of all writers." If we except the language already cited regarding Homer, we nowhere meet with so enthusiastic a reference to any heathen author. It has been thought that, second only to the influence which the writings of Plato exerted over Philo, must be placed that produced by the Pythagoreans, and in various passages of his works (as, for instance, iii. 510) we find reference made to that school of thought. He was familiar with arithmetic, geometry, music, grammar, and other branches of an ancient liberal education. He highly prized philosophy, terming it the "fountain of all blessings, of all things which are really good" (iii. 349). He frequently speaks of that department of it, which he, no less than the moderns, calls "natural philosophy." He says, "Obstinate contention is very unfavourable to the consideration of natural philosophy, which considers the search after truth to be the chief object of rational desire" (iv. 57). He understood that principle of the science which teaches that "it is not the nature of anything to be destroyed so as to become non-existent, but the end brings it back to those elements from which its beginnings came" (iii. 231). In astronomy, he did not rise above the errors of his age, making the earth the centre of the universe (iv. 288), around which revolved the sun, moon, and planets, once in twenty-four hours (ii. 21). He uses the designation "physical science." In passages too long for quotation, he discusses, in a manner not unworthy of a modern geologist, the effects of fire and water in producing the present appearances on the crust of the earth, and combats the arguments of those who maintain

what is now called "the antiquity of man" (iv. 56–61, 205, &c.) He holds the physiological error of spontaneous generation (iv. 238). He does not know whether to seek the chief seat of the mind in the brain or in the heart (ii. 299).

He seems to hold the metaphysical tenet of free will, as against necessity, speaking thus on the subject:—

"On which account the intellect naturally appears to be the only thing in us which is imperishable, for that is the only quality in us which the Father, who created us, thought deserving of freedom; and, unloosing the bonds of necessity, he let it go unrestrained, bestowing on it that most admirable gift, and most connected with himself,—the power, namely, of spontaneous will, as far as he was able to receive it; for the irrational animals, in whose soul there is not that especial gift tending to freedom,—namely, mind,—are put under the yoke, and have bridles put in their mouths, and so are given unto men to be their slaves, as servants are given to their masters. But man, who has bestowed on him a voluntary and self-impelling intellect, and who for the most part puts forth his energies in accordance with deliberate purpose, very properly receives blame for the offences which he designedly commits, and praise for the good actions which he intentionally performs. For in the case of other plants and other animals, we cannot call, either the good that is caused by them deserving of praise, nor the evil that they do deserving of blame; for all their motions in either direction, and all their changes, have no design about them, but are involuntary. But the soul of man, being the only one which has received from God the power of voluntary motion, and which in this respect has been made to resemble God, and being, as far as possible emancipated from the authority of that grievous and severe mistress—necessity, may rightly be visited with reproach, if she does not pay due honour to the being who has emancipated her. And, therefore, in such a case, she will most deservedly suffer the implacable punishment denounced against slavish and ungrateful minds."—(I. 852.)

In politics, Philo was a "democrat," for he says:—

"But there are two species of cities,—the one better, the other worse. That is the better which enjoys a democratic government,—a constitution which honours equality, the rulers of which are law and justice, and such a constitution as this is a hymn to God. But that is the worst kind which adulterates this constitution, just as base and chipped money is adulterated in the coinage, being, in fact, ochlocracy, which admires inequality, in which injustice and lawlessness bear sway. Now good men are enrolled as citizens in the constitution of the first-mentioned kind of city; but the multitude of the wicked cling to the other and worse sort,—loving disorder more than orderliness, and confusion rather than well-established steadiness."—(II. 28.)

As shewn by Thirlwall in his *History of Greece*, democracy

signifies government by the people acting through legal channels; and ochlocracy, mob-law, after all constitutional regulations have been trampled under foot.

In another place he uses the language:—

“Being desirous of the establishment of democracy in the soul, the most excellent of constitutions, instead of tyrannies and absolute sovereignties.”—(II. 446).

Reading over these and several other passages, in which Philo speaks of his political opinions, we feel no doubt as to what they were. He was not for absolute monarchy; nor did he suppose mob law favourable to liberty, for in one place he says, “The multitude invariably attack those who do not share in their frenzy” (iii. 109). He was of opinion that, if the masses of the people broke down all legal barriers, and made their will law, their rule was the worst possible; but that legal voting, or what we should call universal, or well nigh universal, suffrage, was the best government that could be established.

To sum up, his intellectual attainments shew him to have been a man of very remarkable capacity. His great mental weakness—the predominance of fancy over judgment—we shall treat of at another part of the article. The subject that next demands investigation is that of his MORAL CHARACTER; and as belief and practice are most closely connected with each other, we commence the inquiry by a statement of his views on ETHICS.

He says in one place: “For he himself [meaning God] is a lawgiver, and the fountain of all laws, and all particular lawgivers are subordinate to him.”—(i. 239.) From this it may be inferred that he seeks the foundation of moral obligation in the revealed will of God; yet doubt not he was aware that that will was not arbitrary but under the control, if such a word be permissible, of the moral attributes of the Deity.

Rising thoroughly above such a product of philosophy, falsely so called, as the selfish system of ethics, he boldly enunciated the truth, that each virtue is its own reward.

“For wisdom itself is the reward of wisdom; and justice, and each of the other virtues, is its own reward. And truth, as being the most beautiful in the whole company, and as being the chief of all the holy virtues, is in much greater degree its own recompense and reward, affording as it does, happiness to all who practise it, and blessings of which they cannot be deprived to their children and descendants.”—(III. 802.)

The superiority of his ethical views to those of Josephus, will be at once apparent by a glance at the two subjoined quotations, which we place in parallel columns:—

“ Whence one may wonder at Porybius of Megalopolis, who, though otherwise a good man, yet saith that Antiochus [Epiphanes] died, because he had a purpose to plunder the temple of Diana in Persia ;” *for the purpose to do a thing, but not actually doing it, is not worthy of punishment.*—(Josephus's *Antiqu.*, book xii. chap. ix. § 1.)

“ On Cain he lays well-deserved and fitting curses ; for in the first place, he says to him, ‘ And now cursed art thou upon the earth ;’ shewing first of all that *he is polluted and accursed, not now for the first time when he has committed the murder, but that he was so before, the moment that he conceived the idea of it, the intention being of equal importance with the perfected action ;* for as long as we only conceive wicked things in the bad imagination of our minds, still, during that time, we are guilty of thoughts only, for the mind is capable of being changed even against its will ; but when performance is added to the intention that has been conceived, then our deliberate purpose becomes also guilty ; for this is the chief distinction between voluntary and involuntary sin.”—(*Philo*. I. 266.)

Josephus has the honour of having understood and advocated toleration, though it may be suspected that the sapping of his faith in Judaism, consequent on the intimate relations he maintained to the Romans and other Gentiles, may have assisted him to form right conclusions on the subject. In Philo, on the contrary, there is a passage breathing the very spirit of persecution. It is this :—

“ And there are some of the Gentiles, who, not attending to the honour due to the one God alone, deserve to be punished with extreme severity of punishment, as having forsaken the most important classification of piety and holiness, and as having chosen darkness in preference to the most brilliant light, and having rendered their own intellect blind when it might have seen clearly. But it is well that a charge should be given to all those who have any admiration for virtue, to inflict all such punishment out of hand without any delay, not bringing them before either any judgment-seat, or any council, or any bench of magistrates, but giving vent to their own disposition, which hates evil and loves good, so as to chastise the impious with implacable rigour, looking upon themselves as everything for the time being, counsellors and judges, and generals, and members of the assembly, and accusers, and witnesses, and laws, and the people ; that so, since there is no conceivable hindrance, they may with all their company put themselves forward fearlessly to fight as the champions of holiness.”—(III. 187.)

It was from no barbarity of disposition that Philo proposed to allow such ample licence to the opponents of idolatry. His error arose from his not understanding the specialty of the circumstances which warranted Phinehas in inflicting the sum-

mary punishment described in the 25th chapter of Numbers. Believing that precedent to be of universal applicability, his loyalty to Scripture made him defend it, and advocate persecution, though we have no doubt that his temperament was one sensitively averse to bloodshed.

Summing up his moral characteristics, there is every reason to believe that his conduct was conformable to his high ethical sentiments. There is through all his writings every mark of sincerity, with a total absence of that vanity and egotism which are so painfully prominent in the works of Josephus. In short, his compeer, the illustrious historian, was a thoroughly worldly man, while he, on the contrary, had the unworldliness of a recluse, who sought to obtain the favour of God, and maintain a conscience void of offence towards men. We advance next to his views on Natural Theology. He reasons in favour of the being of a God, quite like a modern Christian apologist, making skilful use of the argument from design :—

“ It has invariably happened that the works which they have made have been, in some degree, the proofs of the character of the workmen ; for who is there who, when he looks upon statues or pictures, does not at once form an idea of the statuary or painter himself ? And who, when he beholds a garment, or a ship, or a house, does not in a moment conceive a notion of the weaver, or shipbuilder, or architect, who has made them ?

“ But if any one comes into a well-ordered city, in which all parts of the constitution are exceedingly well arranged and regulated, what other idea will he entertain, but that the city is governed by wise and virtuous rulers ? He, therefore, who comes into that which is truly the greatest of cities, namely this world, and who beholds all the land, both the mountain and the champaign district full of animals, and plants, and the streams of rivers, both overflowing and depending on the wintry floods, and the steady flow of the sea, and the admirable temperature of the air, and the varieties and regular revolution of the seasons of the year ; and then, too, the sun and moon, the rulers of day and night, and the revolutions and regular motions of all the other planets and fixed stars, and of the whole heavens ; would he not naturally, or I should rather say, of necessity, conceive a notion of the Father, and Creator, and Governor of all this system ; for there is no artificial work whatever which exists of its own accord ? But the world is the most artificial and skilfully made of all works, as if it had been put together by some one who was altogether accomplished and most perfect in knowledge.

“ It is in this way that we have received an idea of the existence of God.”—(III. 182-3.)

In attempting, however, to solve the inexplicable problem of the “origin of evil,” he undergoes the ordinary fate of those who adventure themselves on that great undertaking ; in other

words, he suffers shipwreck. This is the way he commences on the subject :—

“ And he would not err who should raise the question, Why Moses attributed the creation of man alone not to one Creator, as he did that of other animals, but to several ? For he introduces the Father of the universe using this language, ‘ Let us make man after our image, and in our likeness.’ Had he then, shall I say, need of any one whatever to help him, He to whom all things are subject ? ”

After repudiating such an idea, Philo propounds a hypothesis to remove the difficulty. He states, that of existing things there are some, for example, plants and irrational animals, which partake neither of virtue nor of vice ; some which partake of virtue alone, as for instance the stars, “ for they are said to be animals, and animals endowed with intelligence (!) ; ” and, finally, some of a mixed nature, like man, who is a compound of good and of evil qualities. Having laid down these positions, he then proceeds :—

“ Now it was a very appropriate task for God the Father of all to create by himself alone, those things which were wholly good, on account of their kindred with himself. And it was not inconsistent with his dignity to create those which were indifferent, since they too are devoid of evil, which is hateful to him. To create the beings of a mixed nature, was partly consistent and partly inconsistent with his dignity : consistent by reason of the more excellent idea which is mingled in them ; inconsistent because of the opposite and worse one.

“ It is on this account that Moses says at the creation of man alone that God said, ‘ Let us make man,’ which expression shews an assumption of other beings to himself as assistants, in order that God, the governor of all things, might have all the blameless intentions and actions of man, when he does right, attributed to him ; and that his other associates might bear the imputation of his contrary actions. For it was fitting that the Father should in the eyes of his children be free from all imputation of evil ; and vice and energy in accordance with vice are evil.”—(I. 20, 21, 22 ; II. 36–39.)

This paragraph, though quite unsatisfactory for its primary object, namely, to explain “ the origin of evil,” is of no slight interest in a historic point of view, the reason being that it manifestly contains the germs of gnosticism. Theological students, when first they learn from the pages of Mosheim the nature of the gnostic tenets, cannot forbear from feeling contempt for the men who could embrace, and then spend their lives in propagating, such patent absurdities ; but as in most other cases, increased thought brings with it an enhanced measure of tolerance ; and one comes to look on the leading gnostics, not as fools, but as men of high gifts, who entangled themselves in the meshes of error, and corrupted and broke up the Christian church, because they were not humble enough to

forbear insisting on solving problems beyond the reach of human intellect. The next point that demands investigation is THE ATTITUDE OF PHILO TOWARDS DIVINE REVELATION.

There is abundant evidence that he regarded Scripture as inspired. He calls Moses the sacred historian (ii. 401, iv. 322, &c.) the "hierophant," or "the great hierophant" (i. 289). He says of him:—"Moses did not so much conjecture as receive the impulse of divine inspiration under which he prophesied of the seventh day" (iii. 151), and "using as instructors the laws of the country, which it would have been impossible for the human mind to devise without divine inspiration" (iii. 524). He speaks of the "sacred Scripture" (ii. 63), the "sacred volumes" (iii. 524), the "holy volume" (*ibid.*), the "Holy Scriptures" (ii. 30), and the "word of God" (iii. 477), and expresses his belief that "we must consider the Holy Scriptures infallible" (iv. 290).

Nevertheless, Philo, as is well known, was one of those who adopted the allegorical method of interpreting Scripture, afterwards so prevalent at Alexandria; and it is interesting to inquire by what mental process he lapsed into such an error in hermeneutics.

Two extracts from his works will explain the point. The first is from his account of the fall:—

"And these statements appear to me to be dictated by a philosophy which is symbolical rather than strictly accurate. For no trees of life or of knowledge have ever, at any previous time, appeared upon the earth, nor is it likely that any will appear hereafter. But I rather conceive that Moses was speaking in an allegorical spirit, intending by his paradise to intimate the dominant character of the soul, which is full of innumerable opinions, as the figurative paradise was of trees. And by the tree of life he was shadowing out the greatest of the virtues, namely, piety towards the gods, by means of which the soul is made immortal; and by the tree which had the knowledge of good and evil, he was intimating that wisdom and moderation, by means of which things contrary in their nature to one another are distinguished."—(I. p. 46.)

The second extract is from his comment on the case of Cain:—

"'And Cain went out from before the face of God, and dwelt in the land of Nod, opposite to Eden.' Now we may raise the question whether we are to take the expressions which occur in the books that have been handed down to us by Moses, and to interpret them in a somewhat metaphorical sense, while the ideas which readily present themselves as derived from the names are very deficient in truth. For if the living God has a place, and if he who desires to leave it can with perfect ease rise up and depart to another place, why do we

repudiate the impiety of the Epicureans, or the godlessness of the Egyptians, or the mythical suggestions of which life is full? For the face is a portion of an animal; but God is a whole, not a part," &c.

After much more to the same effect, he finally adds:—

"It now remains for us, considering that some of these things are spoken of in terms of strict propriety, to turn to the allegorical system, which is dear to men versed in natural philosophy, taking the first principles of our argument from this source."—(I. 286–7–8.)

These passages will explain how it was that he fell into the error of allegorising to a lesser or greater extent nearly every part of Scripture to which his thoughts were turned. Interpreting at first with an amount of prosaic literality which a Colenso might envy, he was stumbled on meeting with such statements as that there existed in Eden "a tree of knowledge," or such phrases as "the face of the Lord," and bounding off to the other extreme, he forswore literality nearly altogether, or at least he gave it a very subordinate place, reserving his best efforts for the symbolical. He says himself:—

"It is worth while, however, after having thus explained the literal account given to us of these events, to proceed to explain also the figurative meaning concealed under that account; for we say that nearly all, or that at all events the greater part, of the history of the giving of the law is full of allegories."—(II. 459.)

Though spiritualising, or at least allegorising, the several festivals and other institutions of the Jewish worship, he did not on that account advocate that the laws relating to them should no longer be observed. On the contrary, he used this language on the subject:—

"For although the seventh day is a lesson to teach us the power which exists in the uncreated God, and also that the creature is entitled to rest from his labours, it does not follow that on that account we may abrogate the laws which are established respecting it, so as to light a fire, or till land, or carry burdens, or bring accusations, or conduct suits at law, or demand a restoration of a deposit, or exact the repayment of a debt, or do any other of the things which are usually permitted at times which are not days of festival. Nor does it follow, because the feast is the symbol of the joy of the soul, and of its gratitude towards God, that we are to repudiate the assemblies ordained at the periodical seasons of the year; nor because the rite of circumcision is an emblem of the excision of pleasures and of all passions, and of the destruction of that impious opinion, according to which the mind has imagined itself to be itself competent to produce offspring, does it follow that we are to annul the law which has been enacted about circumcision. Since we shall neglect the laws about the due observance of the ceremonies in the temple, and numbers of others too, if we exclude all figurative interpretation, and attend only to those things which are expressly ordained in plain words."—(II. 63.)

The foregoing extract, as will be observed, is interesting for another reason than that which has led us to quote it, namely, from the light it throws upon the method in which the Alexandrian Jews were wont to keep the Sabbath at the time when Philo wrote.

Another consideration must be taken into account in our efforts to explain the allegorical tendencies of Philo, that he was naturally desirous of making Scripture truth less distasteful to the fastidious Greeks by whom he was surrounded. When a man, eminently pious, is gifted with an amount of ability which, properly cultivated, leads to his attaining distinction, he is sure, more or less, to be brought into contact with other eminent men, only a few of whom sympathise with his religious views. The others debate with him on the subject, and urge the objections to revelation which they themselves regard as the most difficult to answer. Philo, from the reputation he had reached at Alexandria, must often have had to act as defendant in such disputes regarding faith, originated by the subtle heathen Greeks of his acquaintance. This being so, he would insensibly glide into methods of stating divine truth, which would in his view be calculated to neutralise the force of those arguments which he had heard adduced by opponents; just as a Thomas Chalmers, or a Hugh Miller, thrown into the society, or familiar with the works, of geologists and other scientific men, some of them but very partially under the influence of faith, naturally addressed themselves to initiate schemes fitted to deaden the force of objections which they had heard alleged to portions of revelation. The two last-named distinguished men, both of high poetic gifts, nevertheless kept a pretty strict rein on imagination. Philo, on the contrary, let his fancy run riot; and page after page of his volumes is full of disquisitions, so manifestly ingenious rather than solid, that parts of his works are positively wearisome reading.

What makes this the more to be regretted is, that living not far from Palestine at the very time when the divine Redeemer was upon earth, he might, had he only been judicious enough to wish it, have given us many most interesting historic facts, the narrating of which, to put the matter on its very lowest ground, would have redounded to his own credit, and made his name known to multitudes in every succeeding age. It is instructive to note the very different literary fates of Josephus and Philo: Josephus known, at least by name, to nearly every Christian, and actually read by a good many; Philo, not at all extensively perused, and almost entirely unknown to the ordinary members of Christian churches. There is a deep reason for the difference. Josephus is replete with facts. Philo is every-

where full of wire-drawn speculations and of posthumous celebrity, the *Times* ago said, that when the poems of a literatus had rested his claim to immortality, might sink into oblivion, the letter which he had written drawing his attention, in somewhat acrid difference between the wholesale and the retail of mutton, might revive his name at a remote time for a time renewed celebrity. The work of those "poems"; the history of Josephus the former is to a large extent a product of fancy; the latter has to do with facts: and the insight into the right in giving to Josephus, rather than to the poets, the reputation.

Still let it not be supposed that the work is wholly ignored contemporary history, and that the transfer to his volume notices of incidents might throw light on the evangelical history. Of his work, which is the most interesting part, there are not a few most valuable paragraphs on the New Testament, which, were they set before the present inquiry, and did space permit, we might scribe in this article.

We turn now to the *doctrinal views* which we find in Philo's works.

Enlightened by revelation, he in many respects in a manner that would do no discredit to a Christian. Thus he says,—

"But the Creator of the universe, the Father who holds together earth and heaven, and the water, and the thing which is composed of any of these things, the whole world, the King of gods and men," &c.

Other passages are to the same effect. In the language,—

"The Father of the universe, the uncreated parent of all things."—(I. 186.)

"God creates nothing for himself, inasmuch as he is nothing."—(I. 186.)

"The great cause of all things."—(I. 186.)

He believes in God, not merely as creator of all things, for he says,—

"Moreover, it is considered also that the Father of the world, does by the law of nature take care of the created, exerting his providence in behalf of the whole of its parts."—(III. 350.)

So also again he not unfrequently uses the phrase, "Divine Providence"—(e.g. ii. 150).

Yet he does not consider God the cause of evil, but only of good:—

"Because many men wish to escape from accusations which are brought against themselves, and think it fitting that they should be delivered from the punishments due to the offence which they have committed, and so they attribute their own iniquity to him who is the cause of no evil, but of all kinds of good, namely, to God."—(II. 84, 85.)

To omit many other passages on the divine attributes, which we had transcribed, the following outburst of adoring gratitude to the ever blessed One, may fitly conclude this part of the subject:—

"O bountiful God! thy graces and mercies are boundless and unlimited, and they have no boundary and no end, bursting up like fountains full of perfection, which are continually drawn upon and are never dry."—(II. 100.)

Commenting, as Philo does, on a great portion of the Old Testament, though on a system so much the reverse of orderly, that one often falls in with elaborate investigations as to the meaning of a verse, in a place where one would never have thought of looking for it, he necessarily has to pass in review before him many of the Messianic prophecies. Though in dealing with these he manifests greatly superior spiritual insight to that shewn by Josephus, yet on the whole he disappoints legitimate expectation. The following is his comment on part of Gen. iii. 15 —

"And the expression, 'he shall watch thy head, and thou shalt watch his heel,' is, as to its language, a barbarism, but, as to the meaning which is conveyed by it, a correct expression. Why so? It ought to be expressed with respect to the woman; but the woman is not he, but she. What, then, are we to say? From his discourse about the woman he has digressed to her seed and her beginning. Now the beginning of the outward sense is the mind. But the mind is masculine, in respect of what one may say, he, his, and so on. Very correctly, therefore, does God here say to pleasure, that the mind shall watch your principal and predominant doctrine, and you shall watch the traces of the mind itself, and the foundation of the things which are pleasing to it, to which the heel has very naturally been likened.

"But the words 'shall watch,' intimate two things. In the first place, it means as it were 'shall keep' and 'shall preserve.' And in the second place, it is equivalent to 'shall watch for the purpose of destroying.' Now it is inevitable that the mind must be either bad or good. Now, if it be bad, it would be but a foolish guardian and dispenser of pleasure, for it rejoices in it. But the good man is an enemy to it, excepting that, when he once attacks it, he will be able

utterly to destroy it. And, indeed, on the c watches the footsteps of the foolish man, but c and undermine the standing ground of the wise : is always meditating its destruction, but that t sidering the means by which its safety may be nevertheless, though pleasure appears to trip up a man, it will in reality be tripped up itself by the Jacob; and that, too, not in the wrestling of t struggle which the soul carries on against the d antagonistic to it, and which attack it throug passions and vices; and it will not let go the passion, before it surrenders, and confesses, th tripped up and defeated, both in the matter of t in that of the blessing . . .”—(I. 157–8).

There was a clear foreshadowing of the n in the nature of Abel's offering, namely, a the very essence of saving faith in the spi presented. Philo scarcely appreciates this the subject:—

“Moses here intimates the difference betwee and one who is thoroughly devoted to God; for self the first-fruits of his fruits, and very impioi as worthy only of the secondary and inferior c pression, ‘after some days,’ implies that he did n and when it is said that he offered of the fruits, did not offer of the best fruits which he had, ar iniquity. But the other, without any delay, off and oldest of all his flocks, in order that in this be treated unworthily.”—(IV. 816.)

Never till Christ came was it known meaning latent under the prophecy to Ab preceding patriarchs, “in thee shall all the f be blessed;” but we think Philo might l approach to conceiving it aright, than he h joined extract:—

“ ‘For in thee shall all the nations of the ear this oracle appears to the wise man in respect o respect of others. For if the mind which is in m virtue, and if the tribes of that earthly past w purified at the same time, which tribes have f external senses, and of the greatest channel of a and if any one, either in his house, or in his ci or in his nation, becomes a lover of wisdom, it : house, and that city, and that country, and tha to a better life. For as those spices which are sons near them with their fragrance, so in the those persons who are neighbours of and contigi catch some of the exhalations which reach to and so become improved in their characters.”—(

Philo allegorised the narrative of the fall, and after repeating his feeble explanation of that most fell catastrophe, he almost necessarily failed to detect the full significance of the remarkable scene in which Moses "lifted up the serpent in the wilderness :—

"The serpent, then, which appeared to the woman, that is, to life depending on the outward senses and on the flesh, we pronounce to have been pleasure, crawling forward with an indirect motion, full of innumerable wiles, unable to raise itself up, ever cast down on the ground, creeping only upon the good things of the earth, seeking lurking places in the body, burying itself in each of the outward senses as in pits and caverns, a plotter against man, designing destruction to a being better than itself, eager to kill with its poisonous but painless bite. But the brazen serpent, made by Moses, we explain as being the disposition opposite to pleasure, namely, patient endurance, on which account it is that he is represented as having made it of brass, which is a very strong material. He, then, who with sound judgment contemplates the appearance of patient endurance, even if he has been previously bitten by the allurements of pleasure, must inevitably die ; for the one holds over his soul a death to be arrested by no prayers, but self-restraint proffers him health and preservation of life ; and temperance, which repels evils, is a remedy and perfect antidote for intemperance. And every wise man looks upon what is good as dear to him, which is also altogether calculated to ensure his preservation."—(I. 398.)

He is partially blind to the remote reference of Balaam's prophecy, thinking it enough to make this comment on one of its most remarkable portions—

"For a man will come forth, says the Word of God, leading a host and warring furiously, who will subdue great and populous nations."—(III. 477.)

Nor has he a suspicion of the real dignity which should attach to the prophet "like unto Moses," whom God should raise up—

"And He says that if they are truly pious, they shall not be deprived of a proper knowledge of the future ; but that some other prophet will appear to them on a sudden, inspired like himself, who will preach and prophesy among them, saying nothing of his own (for he who is truly possessed and inspired, even when he speaks, is unable to comprehend what he is himself saying), but that all the words that he should utter would proceed from him as if another was prompting him ; for the prophets are interpreters of God, who is only using their voices as instruments, in order to explain what he chooses."—(III. 190.)

Not in one instance, so far as we have observed, has Philo risen to the proper Messianic interpretation of a prophecy.

Nevertheless, there are sundry evangelical sentiments scattered through his great work. He speaks, for instance, of—

"Most acceptable prayers by which they seek favour of God, entreating pardon for their sin; mercy, not for their own merits, but through the nature of that being who will have forgiveness of men."—(III. 289.)

Here we have the very essence of evangelism; we cannot but feel deeply grieved that Philo, in his visits he paid to the home of his nation, had not come into contact with Jesus. Similar to the last, so satisfactory, is the next:—

"Accordingly, the Levite is the minister of God, for he performs all the ministrations which have reference to holiness, according to which the human race is brought to the notice of God, either by whole burnt offerings, or by saving sacrifices, or else by repentance of our sins."

As we learn from Heb. xi., or, indeed, from the constitution of our own spirit, failing principle of the old Jewish heroes, of great importance—

"And he who has learned this lesson, and who preserves these things in his mind, will bring the most excellent offering, namely, *faith*."—(I. 16.)

It is not to God incarnate that he refers in these passages, but to God in his essence:—

"Let an imperishable hope and trust in God be in our souls, as he has often preserved our nation from difficulties and distresses."—(IV. 148.)

"The attractive mercies of the Saviour."—(I. 16.)

Finally, our author acknowledges that the material is essential to spiritual life and progress:—

"For without divine grace it is impossible to stand in the ranks of mortal things, or to remain steadily in those which are imperishable."—(I. 483.)

Two concluding extracts on the state of the soul as true as they are beautiful:—

"For in reality every soul of a wise man has its home in heaven, and looks upon earth as a strange land, and considers his own home; but the house of the wise man is in which it proposes to sojourn for a while."—(I. 16.)

"But in my opinion, and in that of my friends, the company of the pious would be preferable to life in the world; those who die in the company of the pious, receive the reward of life; but everlasting death will be the portion of those who live the other way."—(I. 285.)

Reading such passages as these, we are reminded of that young man whom when Jesus saw he loved, and said to him, "Thou art not far from the kingdom of heaven."

The view here expressed in regard to the moral and religious character of Philo, is held also by Dr Edersheim, who states it in his "History of the Jews," pp. 447-8 (Edinburgh, 1856); while Dean Milman, in his work on "Jewish History" (4 ed., London, 1866), pp. 133, 136, 141, 149, accuses Philo of giving highly coloured representations of the persecution at Alexandria and the embassy to Caligula.

In conclusion, it may be added, that finding it impossible at the end of an article to enter on a cognate subject of considerable extent, and no slight interest, we have for the present forbore to examine the numerous passages in Philo which throw light on the New Testament, the most important being the notice of Pilate's character and proceedings (iv. 164-5), and the doctrine of the *Logos*, in some respects approaching to, and in others diverging from, that of the gospel and epistles of St John.

R. H.

ART. V.—*Assyria and her Monuments.*

"THE site of the second, or great Assyrian monarchy," says Professor Rawlinson, "was the upper portion of the Mesopotamian Valley. The cities which successively formed its capitals lay, all of them, on the middle Tigris; and the heart of the country was a district on either side that river, enclosed within the thirty-fifth and thirty-seventh parallels. By degrees these limits were enlarged; and the term, Assyria, came to be used, in a loose and vague way, of a vast and ill-defined tract extending on all sides from this central region. Herodotus considered the whole of Babylonia to be a mere district of Assyria. Pliny reckoned to it all Mesopotamia. Strabo gave it, besides these regions, a great portion of Mount Zagros,—the modern Kurdistan,—and all Syria as far as Cilicia, Judea, and Phoenicia."* This region has recently started up, as if disentombed from the long years of forgotten centuries. With deep interest has the Christian world marked

* The Five Great Monarchies of the Ancient Eastern World. By George Rawlinson, M.A., Camden Professor of Ancient History in the University of Oxford, &c. Vol. i., pp. 225, 226.

the discovery and development of the remains of Nineveh; and, notwithstanding the incredulity of such able and conscientious men as the late Lord Macaulay and Sir George Cornewall Lewis, and the still lingering doubts of some British savans, we cannot but regard, in general terms, the decipherment and interpretation of those strange records to be as marvellous and as real as, after the lapse of so many ages, their very appearance and exposure to the light of day. They have a precision and a purpose, an accuracy and a finish, an entire elevation in art and design, indicating the ruins of a great empire, far in advance of those rude sculptures, that for seven miles along the eastern side of the gulf of Suez have singled out the *Wadi Mokatteb* as one of the grandest picture galleries of Arabia. And, whilst various sources have been, and may be, assigned to the inscriptions of the "Written Valley," there can be little doubt that the great mass of them are of a Pre-Christian age, and whether we refer them to a Jewish or a Nabathean origin (for Jethro and his family were in closest intimacy with Moses, and even the Edomites under the Maccabees became Jews), the tablets of the Arabian desert must be allowed to stand out as a time-honoured testimony to the antiquity and truth of the Mosaic record. But the Assyrian monuments fill a wider range, and speak with a louder voice; they tell of a mighty and dominant civilisation, and, transferred to the museums of the most civilised nations of Europe, give a clearer and more decided attestation to the events of Biblical history. Altogether, we live in marvellous times, whether we advert to the decipherment of the hieroglyphics of Egypt; or the hoary records of Phoenicia, dug up from the tombs and sarcophagi of Tyre and Sidon; or the *ausam*, the tokens of the Bedaween Arabs, scribbled amidst the ruins of Rabbath-Ammon, the metropolis of the old kingdom of Bashan, the graphic symbols that puzzled De Saulcy, as well as most others of our curious antiquarians in the east; or the arrow-headed characters that appear upon the rocks, and the ruins, and the subterranean remains of Nineveh, and Babylon, and Persepolis.

There is unquestionably a feeling of deep emotion and strange wonderment, to be carried back to a period between two and three thousand years, and to see with our own eyes the names of the "Tyrians," and the "Sidonians," and the "men of Accho," and to place our finger on the very words, as in the tenth line of the forty-third plate of the British Museum; or, to do the same, to the very names first of "Sennacherib" at the beginning, and then of "Merodach-Baladan" a little way farther on, in plate sixty-third, that of Bellino's cylinder; or, to muse in silence, as we gaze at the slab from the North-West Palace of Nimrod, and mark, in the eighth line of plate thirty-

third, the distinct mention of "Judea, whose place is afar off." * A voice speaks to us from the tomb in the old language of Assyria, almost in the words of the Hebrew prophet, "The grass withereth, the flower fadeth; but the word of our God shall stand for ever" (Isa. xl. 8).

The peculiarities of the arrow-headed characters, however, are many. Some of those characters are determinative, denoting a person or a people, &c.; some are alphabetic, consisting of one letter only; some are syllabic, consisting of two or more letters; some are ideographic, representing a deity, or part of the name of a person or place, and having a separate enunciation of their own. Sir Henry Rawlinson gives an indiscriminate list of Babylonian and Assyrian characters, amounting to two hundred and forty-six, and he promises that "the list does not pretend to be complete";† whilst the "inscriptions" in the cuneiform character from Assyrian monuments, published by the British Museum in 1851, are prefixed by no less than ten folio pages of *variants*, or different modes of writing the same thing; and Sir Henry himself has told us, that "the more he has studied the inscriptions of Assyria and Babylonia, and sought to verify previous conclusions, by testing their general applicability, the more reason had he found to mistrust that which before seemed plain." "Yet," he adds, a little way on in the same Memoir, "I do not despair but that ultimately a severe and extensive comparison of all available materials, combined with the fertility of invention, which is an essential element in the art of the decipherer, will render the Assyrian legends at least as intelligible as the Egyptian." This anticipation occurs in his Memoir published in the "Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society,"‡ so far back as the year 1851; and Sir Henry has since done much to redeem his promise. Still it would appear that our march through the Assyrian territory is

. . . "Per ignes
Suppositos cineri doloso."

Have we any just ground, therefore, to rely on the translations from the arrow-headed inscriptions? Decidedly we have, in the general outline of the decipherment and the interpretation. For the following reasons: If, by some strange fatality, the language of England should have ceased to be spoken, and not only dead, should be scarcely, if at all understood, and the celebrated New Zealander, predicted by Henry Kirk White and Thomas

* Inscriptions in the Cuneiform Character from Assyrian Monuments. Discovered by A. H. Layard, D.C.L. London. 1851.

† Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society. Vol. xiv., part 1.

‡ Memoir on the Babylonian and Assyrian Inscriptions. Chap. i. Journal of Royal Asiatic Society, vol. xiv., p. 1.

Babington Macaulay, should be found standing on London Bridge, wondering at the ruins of St Paul's and Westminster Abbey; and, then, to enlighten the traveller from the antipodes, a stranger from Denmark, and another from Prussia, and a third or more than one from France, should select the unknown tongue from amidst the epitaphs in Latin, and Greek, and Hebrew, that adorn those venerable temples, and should all unite, with very few exceptions, in giving the same meaning, as independent translators and restorers of the lost numbers of Chaucer and Milton, to the crumbling monuments that told of England's worthies, kings, and politicians, and philosophers, and poets, and heroes, and divines, whilst the contemporaneous or concurrent history of other European nations confirmed the results, who could doubt for a moment but that the astonished New Zealander had, by the discernment of his fellow visitants, discovered the key that unlocked the treasures of the classic speech of her Britannic Majesty?

“ Even as the savage sits upon the stone
That marks where stood her capitola, and hears
The bittern booming in the weeds, he shrinks
From the dismaying solitude.”

Such is exactly the case with the translation of the arrow-headed inscriptions. Independent decipherers, in different countries, have given substantially the same translation of the same inscriptions. The chief variations have occurred in the decipherment of proper names, an incident that arises from the fact that, in Babylonian and Assyrian, proper names are generally written, not in phonetic characters, but ideographically, that is, by arbitrary signs. The consequence is, that those names have often been rendered provisionally, having an interrogation placed after them, thus (?), until they shall have been identified by the context, or by Greek or Roman, by Arabic or Bible, history. But the general agreement of the translators has been decidedly tested by the respective versions of the inscription of Tiglath Pileser, 1st King of Assyria, B.C. 1150, by Sir Henry Rawlinson, Fox Talbot, Esq., Dr Hincks, and Dr Oppert. Those translations are in the main the same. We give the testimony of persons whose candour and knowledge are emblazoned in the light of a European reputation. Dean Milman, and Mr Grote, the historian of Greece, express themselves to the following effect:—“ Having gone through this comparison,” say they, “ the examiners certify that the coincidences between the translations, both as to the general sense and verbal rendering, were very remarkable. In most parts there was a strong correspondence in the meaning assigned, and occasionally a curious identity of expression as to particular words. Where the versions differed very materially, each translator had, in many cases, marked the passage, as one

of doubtful or unascertained signification. In the interpretation of numbers, there was throughout a singular correspondence. By all the translators, the inscriptions were understood to relate to King Tiglath Pileser, to his campaigns, building and consecration of temples, and other royal acts; campaigns against nations bearing names mostly analogous to those known from the sacred writings, and from other ancient authorities; temples to deities with appellations bearing the same resemblance to those found in other quarters. There was a constant recurrence of these words, names, and titles, yet a sufficient variety of words to test, to a certain degree, the extent of the knowledge claimed by the translators of the sound of the words, and of the language to which the words are supposed to belong." Such is the verdict of two of the judges. We just add the finding of another: it is that of Sir J. Gardner Wilkinson, the famed Egyptologist, who, in a domain so closely allied to his own, thus speaks:—"My impression, from a comparison of the several passages in the different translations, is: 1st, That the resemblance, very often exactly the same, word for word, is so great, as to render it unreasonable to suppose the interpretation could be arbitrary, or based on uncertain grounds. 2d, That the fact of certain passages which were doubtful, either from the imperfection of the inscription in those places, or from the difficulty of ascertaining the meaning, being marked doubtful in the different translations, or left blank, accounts for some uncertainty or variation occurring in those parts. 3dly, That some words, and names of persons, animals, objects, &c., being uncertain, could only be expected in any language not thoroughly known, especially in one where symbolic signs are often employed instead of the phonetic words; and the occasional differences in the mode of interpreting some words and sentences, may be considered a guarantee of the fairness of the translators, especially when we find that the differences are uniform, the words or sentences so differing having the same meaning attached to them wherever they occur." The same distinguished scholar further says, "That the similarity in the several translations is quite equal to what it would be in the translation of any ordinary historical inscription written in Egyptian hieroglyphics, made by the same number of persons who, as in this case, give it quite independently of, and without any communication with, each other; and this comparison I am disposed to make, as it is the most analogous case that I can suggest." But we need not further insist on this fourfold specimen of decipherment and interpretation. The translations are before the public;* and every man of common

* Inscription of Tiglath Pileser, 1st King of Assyria, B.C. 1150, as translated by Sir H. Rawlinson, &c. London: Parker & Son. 1857.

intelligence may easily satisfy himself as to the fact in how far they agree, and draw his conclusion accordingly. And we shall be much deceived, if that conclusion, in due season, be not in strict conformity to that of the late President of the Royal Asiatic Society, himself an accomplished Orientalist, we mean Professor H. H. Wilson. "Upon the whole," says he, "the result of this experiment—than which a fairer test could scarcely be devised—may be considered as establishing, almost definitely, the correctness of the valuation of the *characters* of these inscriptions. It is possible that further investigations may find something to alter or to add; but the great portion, if not the whole, may be read with confidence."*

Independently of the many translations that have since proceeded from the public press, both in this country and on the continent, the evidence of this fourfold experiment might well be regarded as going far to set the reality of arrow-headed decipherment on a well-grounded basis. But besides all this, Sir Henry Rawlinson has translated a variety of bilingual tablets in the British Museum, on which, according to his key of decipherment, the words written in arrow-heads correspond exactly with the words on the same tablets, written in Phœnician characters. Of the accuracy of translation of arrow-headed writing, in the Assyrian form, a more convincing proof than this we could scarcely desiderate. And although Sir Henry acknowledges that a German scholar, Dr Levy, reads the Phœnician legends on those tablets, "in every instance but one," in a meaning different from his own, yet the large amount of comparative philology which Sir Henry brings to bear upon the tablets, will, we think, go far to silence the Teutonic *savant*, and exhaust the subject, if it do not convince the reader. But to crown the whole, the French Institute, than which there is no society in the world more able to judge, has conferred on Professor Oppert their biennial prize of two thousand francs, for his decipherment of languages in arrow-headed writing; "thereby," says Sir Henry, "guaranteeing, in the face of Europe, the authenticity and value of our labours, and putting to shame the continued scepticism of England." So that, while there is some difficulty in identifying proper names, so as to give their vernacular pronunciation—a difficulty which, from the beginning, has all along been acknowledged—Sir Henry Rawlinson distinctly declares, that "this uncertainty does not in the least affect the authenticity of the translation of historical inscriptions, which are written for the most part phonetically, and the grammar of which can be analysed with as

* Inscription of Tiglath Pileser, 1st King of Assyria, B.C. 1150, p. 9, as translated by Sir H. Rawlinson, &c. London: Parker & Son. 1864.

much confidence as any portion of the Hebrew Scriptures.”*

These words, coming with the authority of a scholar so justly celebrated, may mean either that the arrow-headed Assyrian is very easy, or the Biblical Hebrew very difficult to translate; although we think it will, on all hands, be allowed that, speaking generally, the multiplicity of the alphabet of the Assyrian, the complexity of its ideographic groups, the variety of its variants, and the difficulty of identifying a king or a country, even with a determinative prefixed, present a strong contrast to the paucity of the alphabet of the Hebrew,—the simplicity of its syntax, the precision of its nomenclature, and the perspicuity of its historic style. One thing, it must be granted, is apt at first to create a prejudice against the versions of the Babylonian and Assyrian arrow-heads; and it is this, that whilst we read the Hebrew and the Chaldee Targums of the Old Testament, and the Syriac of the Old and New, and the Arabic of the Koran, as all other Semitic tongues, from right to left, and whilst the language of Babylonia and Assyria is confessedly Semitic, the Babylonian and Assyrian arrow-heads are read from left to right. This is a stumbling-block at the threshold. In the arrow-headed inscriptions scattered throughout Persia, and Babylonia, and Assyria, we have not one, but many alphabets, all under the general system of a combination of arrow-heads: the Persian alphabet of arrow-heads differs from the Babylonian, the Babylonian, in some respects, from the Assyrian, and the Assyrian from the Scythic. But all arrow-headed alphabets, in whatever language, uniformly read from left to right, not from right to left,—unless it be an engraving on a precious stone, in order that the impression, when transferred to wax or clay, might still be read from the left. It may be received, as a universal rule, that the genius of arrow-heads is to proceed from the left to the right. It is, we would suggest, not improbable that nations, regarding their early fatherland as in the North, such as those of the Indo-Germanic type, write from left to right; and that nations, regarding their early fatherland as in the South, such as those of the Semitic type, write from right to left—each respecting the cradle of their emigration: for it is well known that, in Hebrew and Arabic, and to some extent also in Celtic, the word denoting the left hand denotes likewise the north, and the word denoting the right hand denotes likewise the south. But conquest may change at once the alphabet of a language and modify the language itself. And it may

* “*Journal of Royal Asiatic Society.*” *New Series.* Vol. I. p. 1., pp. 187–190. Year 1864.

thus turn out that the practice of writing from right to left, or from left to right, may depend more on the alphabet which conquest, or a higher civilization, or an overwhelming population may impose, than on the original type of the language itself. Now, a large Scythic race, we gather by historical and ethnological evidence, must, from a very early period, have occupied the banks of the Tigris and the Euphrates, and spread itself, not only in Asia, but also in Africa and in Europe, and that antecedently to any very numerous off-shoots of the Medo-Persian or Semitic races. The Semitic race subdued the Scythic in Assyria, after a Scythic dominion, according to Justin, of fifteen hundred years;* and the arms of Cyrus made the Semitic race, in its turn, yield to a Medo-Persian element.† In these circumstances, therefore, it is not to be wondered that, hemmed in as the Semitic race was, both in the beginning and at the close of its domination, by races distinct from its own, and unquestionably mingled up to a very large extent with them, the Semitic race of Babylonia and Assyria, unlike the Hebrews or the Arabs, should have imitated the predominating race of the Scyth and the Persian in writing their public inscriptions, not from right to left, but from left to right. What the Roman did in writing Carthaginian—that is, Phœnician, in the *Poenulus* of Plautus‡—the Scyth or the Persian did in writing Babylonian or Assyrian. In both cases, the writing is reversed.

The fact is, that the arrow-headed inscriptions of Assyria have already opened up a wide domain of philological inquiry and ethnological research: the results, within a few years, have been so various, and the materials so numerous, holding out a harvest of richer fruits still to come, on which the keen eye of Alexander Murray,§ the greatest of our Scottish Orientalists,

* “Scytharum gens antiquissima semper habita. His igitur Asia per mille quingentos annos vectigalis fuit. Pendendi tributum finem Ninus rex Assyriorum imposuit.”—*Justinus*, lib. 2, cap. 1 and 3.

† “Early History of Babylonia,” by Colonel Rawlinson, C.B. *Journal of Royal Asiatic Society*, Vol. xv., part 2, pp. 226–232.

‡ “*Poenulus Plauti*,” actus v., scena 1.

§ The posthumous work of Alexander Murray, Professor of Oriental Languages in Edinburgh, entitled “History of the European Languages, or Researches into the Affinities of the Teutonic, Greek, Celtic, Slavonic, and Indian Nations,” 2 vols. 8vo, published in Edinburgh in 1823, was one of the very earliest works that appeared in Europe on comparative grammar and ethnology. The work had not received the complete deductions of its lamented author, who died at the early age of thirty-seven. The German lexicographer Kaltschmidt, in a letter to the late Lord Murray, of the Court of Session, says, with the characteristic generosity of one able to judge, that “Scotland may glory in having produced the *first* discoverer of the real nature of language.” We just add, Alexander Murray died 15th April 1813, and was buried in the Greyfriars Churchyard, Edinburgh. More than half-a-century has since elapsed, and to this day the distinguished Orientalist remains without an epitaph. Is this to the honour of our Modern Athens?

would have gleamed with delight, that we believe that we err not, when we affirm that the discovery and decipherment of the Assyrian remains will hold the same place in the elucidation of Eastern nations, that the cultivation of Greek learning did for the revival of literature in Europe. Let us hear what is so well said by M. Jules Mohl, the secretary to the Asiatic Society of Paris :—

“ One of the first results,” says he, “ of those labours upon languages, labours so profound and so varied, has been the creation of an entirely new science of comparative grammar, which is an instrument of incomparable delicacy and power, at once for philology and the most ancient epochs of history. It puts us into the condition of penetrating into the laws of language, of unfolding the anomalies of dialects, of fixing with precision the relations of the races of men, and allows us to draw from languages certain indications regarding the state of civilization of each race, in times long before every tradition of history. Besides, it essentially constitutes at present a part of Oriental studies, because it has sprung from them, and has scarcely as yet been applied in earnest to any but the Arian and Semitic tongues. It will be extended one day over all the races of men ; and, in the same manner as Humboldt has already applied it to the Oceanic languages, it will, one day determine the ethnography of America and of Africa ; but the literature of the East will always have the glory of having given it birth.”*

Among the different races of human beings on earth, all may be traced up to one original stock,—our first parents in Eden. The laws of climate and physiology, duly examined, land us ultimately in the primeval unity of the human race. And, in like manner, among the different languages of this world, with the different shades of dialects, whether in the Semitic, the Hamitic, or the Japhetic, all may be traced up

* “ Un des premiers résultats de ces travaux si profonds et si variés sur les langues a été la création d’une science toute nouvelle, de la grammaire comparée, qui est un instrument d’une délicatesse et d’une puissance incomparables, tant pour la philologie que pour les plus anciennes, époques de l’histoire. Elle nous met en état de pénétrer dans les lois du langage, d’expliquer les anomalies des dialectes, de fixer avec précision les parentés des races humaines, et permet de tirer des langues des indications certaines sur l’état de la civilisation de chaque race dans des tems bien antérieurs à toute tradition historique. Elle fait aujourd’hui encore essentiellement partie des études orientales, parce qu’elle en est sortie et qu’elle n’a encore guère été sérieusement appliquée qu’à des langues Ariennes et Sémitiques. Elle s’étendra un jour sur toutes les races humaines, et de même que Humboldt en a déjà fait l’application aux langues océaniques elle déterminera un jour l’ethnographie de l’Amérique et de l’Afrique ; mais les lettres Orientales auront toujours la gloire de lui avoir donné naissance.”

“ Rapport Annuel,” 28 Juin 1865. Sur les travaux du conseil de la Société Asiatique, pendant l’année 1864, 1865.

“ Journal Asiatique,” Paris, Tome vi., pp. 103–4.

to one primitive tongue; and that, too, must have been spoken somewhere about the very spot which the sacred Scriptures have marked out as the place of the earthly Paradise. The laws of human speech, in the one case, not less than the laws of the human frame in the other, lead us back to this mysterious spot, the cradle of the world. From the peculiar custom of every brick or stone in the foundations of Nineveh having been inscribed with a symbolic character or legend, Colonel (now Sir Henry) Rawlinson had hazarded the conjecture, by no means improbable, that if we dug to the foundations of *Birs-i-Nimroud*,—the remains of the old tower of Babel,—and if the original foundation still existed, we would, in all likelihood, find there the written characters of the first language of the world, when “the earth was of one language and of one speech.”* And he afterwards found the cylinders of Nebuchadnezzar, who had repaired it, in the very spot which the sagacious antiquarian himself had previously pointed out.† Certain it is that the members of the late mission of discovery, by the American Government, to the Dead Sea, have viewed with their own eyes, what Josephus tells us existed in his day, the mysterious pillar of encrusted salt,‡ which embodies and represents that female form which, looking back to the abandoned cities of the plain, was there fixed and stationed, as a lasting monument of divine vengeance. Nor would it be strange, from what we have seen, in the preservation of the mummies of Egyptian kings and priests, that the old burial cave of Macpelah should one day be entirely thrown open, and that the embalmed bodies of Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob should be presented to our view, as real and distinct as when Jacob kept the sheep of Laban, or Isaac went out into the fields to

* “Memoir of Cuneiform Inscriptions,” p. 22. “Journal of Royal Asiatic Society,” vol. x., part 1.

† “Journal of Royal Asiatic Society,” vol. xviii., part 1, p. 30.

‡ “As for Lot’s wife,—the pillar of salt mentioned and portrayed by the American expedition in 1848, and of which it is said they took a fragment for a museum at home,—after a good deal of search, we only discovered a crooked, thin spire of rock-salt in one place of the mountain; but it would not have been very remarkable if many such had been found to exist in similar circumstances. It was a place for inducing solemn reflections and intense sensations, such as one could hardly venture to record at the time of being there, or endeavour to repeat now after so long an interval. Much may, however, be imagined by devout readers of the Holy Scriptures, not only as contained in the records of the book of Genesis, but also as inculcated with intense emphasis in the Epistle of Jude, in a later period. Still, there is a vividness of impression to be derived only from being actually on the spot, and surveying the huge extent of water that differs from any other in the world, placid and bright on its surface, yet awful in its rocky boundaries. But where are the cities and their punished inhabitants, except in the Bible, and the traditions preserved by Tacitus, the Korân, and the present inhabitants of the country?”—“Byeways in Palestine,” by James Finn, M.R.A.S., pp. 327–8.

meditate, or Abraham weighed his shekels to Ephron the son of Zohar, in the presence of the children of Heth. And with the present exploration in Palestine, conducted by British Christians, under the smile of the Moslem, what marvels may Providence not reveal! Whilst the arrow-headed inscriptions have started up, as if by a miracle, amidst the ruins of ancient Nineveh, and, on the strictest principles of comparative philology and severe interpretation, have found a tongue and an ear before the civilized world, through the enterprise and erudition and genius of a British officer.

The arrow-headed characters, inscribed upon the rocks and ruins of Assyria and Persia, so called from their resemblance to the head of an arrow, and for a similar reason called cuneiform, that is, wedge-shaped, from their resemblance to a wedge, are used, as we have remarked, in the public or monumental inscriptions of different languages, more particularly the Old Persian, the Scythic, the Babylonian, and, what is very nearly connected with it, the Assyrian. The merit of discovering the arrow-headed alphabet of the old Persian, is due, in different degrees, to more than one orientalist; Professor Grotefend of Göttingen, M. Burnouf of Paris, Dr Beer of Leipsic, Rask, Saint Martin, Jacquet, and Professor Lassen of Bonn, have all contributed their share in identifying, some a few, and others many of, the letters of the alphabet. But, as an independent discoverer, the labours of Colonel Rawlinson, whilst residing in the East, concurred with those of Professor Lassen on the Rhine; and the British soldier has set before us that enlarged and consolidated alphabet of the arrow-heads of ancient Persia, that has become the key to resolve the alphabets of the Scythic, the Babylonian, and the Assyrian inscriptions. The Colonel, now Sir Henry, has, with admirable clearness and modesty, unfolded the process of discovery and decipherment in his "*Memoir on Cuneiform Inscriptions*," and that in a manner as entertaining as Horne Tooke's diversions of Purley, or Alexander Murray's deduction of all the languages of "articulate-speaking men" to a few monosyllabic vocables.

The work of translation first began with the old Persian inscriptions; these are to be found in different places in Persia, such as Hamadan, or the ancient Ecbatana, Persepolis, the Lake Van, the Pass of Keli-Shin, or the Blue Pillar on the Kurdistan mountains,—which separate the plains of Mesopotamia from the Lake Urumiyah,—and above all, at Behistun, otherwise called Baghistan.

It is at this last place that the most extensive and interesting inscription, or series of inscriptions, has been found; and which, by means of the old Persian, has served as a key for opening up the secrets of the Babylonian inscriptions there,

and the Assyrian at Nineveh. The village of Behistun is on the high road from Babylonia to the east ; its rock rises to the height of seventeen hundred feet, abruptly from the plain ; and on the smoothed front of it, at an elevation of three hundred feet, are engraven in the rock three large inscriptions,—the one being a repetition of the other,—in three distinct languages, viz., the old Persian, the Scythic, and the Babylonian ; or, in more generic terms, the Arian, the Turanian, and the Semitic.*

The inscriptions relate the wars and conquests of Darius, the son of Hystaspes, and have been approximately fixed at the year 515 or 516, before the coming of Christ in the flesh. The inscriptions, in the other localities of Persia, are numerous, but of inferior moment ; they chiefly refer to the deaths of kings, or the building of palaces, and are full of invocations or allusions to the Persian god Ormazd. These inscriptions, in different places in Persia, continue through the different monarchs, from the reign of Cyrus the Great, with a slight intermission, down to the reign of Artaxerxes Ochus,—that is, from the year 559 B.C., down to 337 B.C. ; but the most ancient of the Babylonian or Assyrian inscriptions that have been found, have been reckoned by Colonel Rawlinson to be at least two thousand years before Christ's appearance on earth. The Chedor-laomer of Scripture (Gen. xiv. 9), is most probably to be realised as *Apda Martu*, "The ravager of the west" (R.A. 1917).

The Scythic inscription of Behistun, by a comparison with the Persic and Babylonian, has been deciphered and interpreted by Mr E. Norris, of the Royal Asiatic Society ;† and the language which is enclosed in these mystic characters, having been unlocked, adds another link to that wondrous chain of proof of the original unity of the language and race of man, in leading us up to that one language which Adam talked with God in Paradise.

Of the Assyrian inscriptions, as found in Assyria proper, amidst the ruins of Khorsabad and Kouyunjik,—the site of ancient Nineveh,—various translations have been made. The

* The *Arian*, or more correctly *Ariyan*, so called from the *Aria* of ancient India (Behistun inscription, col. 1, par. 6), comprehends what have otherwise been named the Japhetic or Indo-European languages, such as the Sanscrit, Greek, Latin, Teutonic, Slavonic, &c. The *Turanian*, so called from the Arabic *turaiyun*, *silvestris*, *agrestis*, comprehends all the languages of the shepherd clans, or nomadic tribes, including the Mongolian, Turkish, Finnish, &c., otherwise called Hamitic, in its most comprehensive sense. The nomadic celebrity *Tur*, mentioned by Max Müller (*Languages of Seat of War*, p. 88), is a personage that the catalogue of *Toldoth beni Noah* does not acknowledge ; and the *Shemitic*, or Semitic, so called from the patriarch Shem, comprehends the Hebrew, Arabic, and Aramaic.

† "Journal of Royal Asiatic Society," Vol. xv. part 1. London, 1853.

translation of the old Persian, or Achaemenian Babylonian, universally occurring in the first or left-hand column, in the trilingual inscriptions at Persepolis, Hamadan, Van, and Behistun, has become the key for the translation of the Babylonian, as uniformly occurring in the third or right hand column of the same inscriptions ; and thus a comparison having been instituted between the old Persian and the Babylonian, a translation has, in some measure, been effected of the inscriptions on the slabs and bulls of ancient Nineveh, where the Assyrian inscriptions occur isolated and alone. God seems to have preserved the trilingual inscriptions of Persia, in order to afford us a key, for reading in our own day the inscriptions of Nineveh. Just as the inscriptions on the *Rosetta* stone,—the Greek, the hieratic, the demotic or enchorial,—opened up the wonders of the Egyptian hieroglyphics, unveiled the mysteries of Isis and Osiris, and threw open the temples of Thebes, and Edfou, and Esne, and Dendera ; so the threefold inscriptions, on the rock of Behistun, have disclosed the marvels of old Nineveh, where Jonah prophesied, and have deciphered the secret characters on those objects of mysterious awe, before which, or similar to which, Abram may have bowed, ere he knew the true God, and in the very precincts of which, Daniel and Ezekiel, rapt in the visions of the future, may have thundered out the denunciations of the God of Israel, and smiled at the triumph of the coming Messiah, over the pomp and the power, the majesty and the might, of the colossal empire of the east.

“The result of those discoveries,” says Mr Layard,* “had been completely to silence the common remark, that there was no human confirmation of many of the historic facts related in the Bible. They possessed now a valuable collection of contemporary records, executed at the time when many of the most important events mentioned in Scripture were performed, inscribed by those who were actors in those events, and completely tallying with the facts described by the sacred historians.”

Need we mention that the distinct kingdoms of Israel and Judah are recognised on the monuments. On the one hand, “the king of Judah,” and on the other hand, “Beth-Homri, the house or city of Omri,” with the names of “Jehu,” and “Manahem,” and “Hezekiah,” and “Manasseh,” on the side of the Jews, and those of “Pul,” and “Tiglath-Pileser,” and “Sennacherib,” and “Esar-haddon,” on the side of their conquerors.

But, what is to be regarded as the most interesting illustration derived from the Assyrian inscriptions,—the invasion of

* In his speech to the Northamptonshire Mechanics' Institute, Northampton. December 17. 1851.

Judea by Sennacherib, king of Assyria, has been distinctly read from an inscription on four bulls found near the site of ancient Nineveh, copied, in the first instance, by a celebrated traveller,—we mean Mr Layard,—and conveyed by him to England ; and the deciphering and translating of that inscription may justly be considered as one of the happiest and most momentous discoveries of the wonderful days in which we live. It is very natural that the soldier-student of this strange and mysterious lore should have been moved and excited,—as we have reason to believe that he was,—in no ordinary degree, when there flashed before his eyes the brilliant revelation of this grand and unexpected discovery. For upwards of two thousand years, there the inscription had lain, unseen, unknown, unread ; and the same, to all intents and purposes, as if it had not been in existence. The infidel and the scoffer doubted if ever there had been such events at all, and the believer had no other document than his Bible by which to answer them, when a stranger from the shores of Britain, who had wandered among the ruins of Lesser Asia, and marvelled at the mouldering heaps, and extensive mounds, in Babylonia, and Chaldea, and Assyria, along the banks of the Tigris and the Euphrates, commenced to dig and excavate amidst the old barrow of *Kouyunjik*, and wonder after wonder meets his view. He finds, among other mysteries, a bull with arrow-headed letters written on it, and another with similar characters mystically inscribed, and another pair, somewhat mutilated, bearing the manifest marks of the same wondrous story. He copies, he transcribes the inscription. The copy falls into the hands of a friend of his in England. This friend had been a pilgrim too ; he had sojourned in Bagdad, and climbed the Kurdish hills, and scaled the rock of *Behistun*, and the *Keli-shin*, in a winter-storm, and had been a soldier amid the wreck and havoc of Affghanistan ; but, amidst the toils of war and bloodshed, he had amused himself with old records, and crabbed characters on hoary ruins and high mountain tops, whether they were the letters of ancient Zend, or kindred Pehlevi, or parent Sanscrit, or mellifluous Arabic, or elegant Persian, Turkish, Coptic, or Armenian, Hebrew, Syriac, or Chaldean,—all came with equal zest to him, and he smiled upon them all, as if he beheld the face of a brother. The inscription on the bull of old Nineveh came into the hands of this man. He was just the person that God, in his providence, after a silence of more than twenty centuries, had designed for it ; and, what marvel in one so fitted and raised up for the purpose ?—he deciphered, read, and explained it ! The light of history burst in upon him from a new and unexpected opening. The high happiness of discovering a confirmation of great historical

truths, that must exert a mighty influence in establishing the authority of a Book which is a guide through the darkness of the grave, from time into eternity, must have elevated and ennobled his spirit. Yes, and let us hope that, from the perusal of the arrow-headed letters of the strange statue of old Nineveh, he rose, with a warmer heart and with a keener relish, to the truth and divinity of the unchallengeable records of the God of Israel.

Independently rendered by Sir Henry Rawlinson and Dr Hincks, the inscription, as at first written, may be read on the colossal idol, now standing in the British Museum, transplanted from the grand entrance of the palace of *Kouyunjik*, and, by a mysterious providence, constrained to attest the truth of the narrative, as written by the pen of inspiration, in the Hebrew Scriptures. Colonel Rawlinson gave his version so far back as seventeen years ago.* Dr Hincks, with the full claims of an original discoverer, has, in all the main points, confirmed the marvellous details;† whilst Mr Layard, in the narrative of his second expedition,‡ with some pertinent remarks of his own, has given an admirable summary of the conclusions at which the two separate translators have arrived.

The Assyrians and Babylonians had not merely an alphabet, but a syllabarium; that is, not only signs to denote letters, but signs to denote syllables. And the patient and laborious investigation that Sir Henry Rawlinson and Dr Hincks have independently, and to a large extent concurrently, employed in this minute and ingenious analysis, is worthy of our highest admiration. We cannot sufficiently express our astonishment at the unwearied toil and application, the acumen and research, with the resources of comparative philology and universal grammar, all brought to bear with resistless assiduity on the stores of eastern learning, which those two eminent men have displayed,—the one a soldier and the other a divine,—it would be hard to tell to whom the palm is due. With many versions of the Assyrian and Babylonian inscriptions, in the transactions of the Irish Academy, and other literary and scientific journals, Dr Hincks, as an original investigator, has, among other contributions, given us a luminous account of his system of Babylonian syllabification;§ and Sir Henry Rawlinson, like

* *Athenæum* of 23d August 1851, page 908.

† See "Literary Gazette," 27th June 1846, and "Transactions of the Royal Irish Academy," Vol. xxii. page 34, as quoted by Layard, in his "Second Expedition to Nineveh and Babylon," page 139.

‡ "Discoveries in the Ruins of Nineveh and Babylon, Second Expedition," pp. 139–145.

§ "On the Assyrio-Babylonian Phonetic Characters." By the Rev. Edward Hincks, D.D. Read May 24. 1852. "Transactions of the Royal Irish Academy," Vol. xxii. part 4. Dublin, 1853.

another Xenophon, wields the pen with the same mastery that he draws the sword. The gallant Colonel thus describes his elaboration of the Assyrian characters:—

“As the Greek translation, then, on the Rosetta Stone first led the way to the decipherment of the hieroglyphic writing of Egypt, so have the Persian texts of the trilingual cuneiform tablets served as a stepping-stone to the intelligence of the Assyrian and Babylonian inscriptions. The tablets of Behistun, of Nakhsh-i-Rustam, and Persepolis, have, in the first place, furnished a list of more than eighty proper names, of which the true pronunciation is fixed by their Persian orthography, and of which we have also the Babylonian equivalents. A careful comparison of these duplicate forms of writing the same name, and a due appreciation of the phonetic distinctions peculiar to the two languages, have thus supplied the means of determining, with more or less certainty, the value of about one hundred Babylonian characters, and a very excellent basis has been thus determined for a complete arrangement of the alphabet. The next step has been to collate inscriptions, and to ascertain or infer, from the variant orthographies of the same name (and particularly the same geographical name), the homophones of each known alphabetical power. In this stage of the inquiry much caution, or, if I may so call it, *critique*, has been rendered necessary; for although two inscriptions may be absolutely identical in sense, and even in expression, it does not by any means follow that, wherever one text may differ from the other, we are justified in supposing that we have found alphabetical variants. Many sources of variety exist, besides the employment of homophones. Ideographs or abbreviations may be substituted for words expressed phonetically; sometimes the allocation is altered; sometimes synonyms are made use of; grammatical suffixes and affixes again may be employed, or suppressed, or modified at option. It requires, in fact, a most ample field of comparison, a certain familiarity with the language, and above all, much experience in the dialectic changes, and in the varieties of alphabetical expression, before variant characters can be determined with any certainty. By mere comparison, however, repeated in a multitude of instances, so as to reduce almost infinitely the chance of error, I have added nearly fifty characters to the hundred which were previously known through the Persian key; and to this acquaintance with the phonetic value of about one hundred and fifty signs is, I believe, limited my present knowledge of the Babylonian and Assyrian alphabets.”*

Thus far Sir Henry speaks of the Assyrio-Babylonian letters, and, in a manner equally admirable, he describes the mode in which he accomplished his translations:—

“The Babylonian translations of the Persian text in the trilingual tablets,” says he, “including, of course, the long inscription at Nakhsh-i-Rustam, and the fragments from Behistun, have furnished

* “The Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland,” Vol. xii. Part ii. pp. 403, 404. London, 1850.

a list of about two hundred Babylonian words, of which we know the sound approximately, and the meaning certainly. These words are almost all found, either in their full integrity, or subjected to some slight modification, in Assyrian, and we can usually, by their means, arrive at a pretty correct notion of the general purport of the phrase in which they occur. The difficult, and at the same time the essential, part of the study of Assyrian, consists in thus discovering the unknown from the known, in laying bare the anatomy of the Assyrian sentences, and, guided by grammatical indications, by a few Babylonian landmarks, and especially by the context, in tracing out, sometimes through Semitic analogies, but more frequently through an extensive comparison of similar or cognate phrases, the meaning of words which are otherwise strange to us. It is in this particular branch of the study, which I have prosecuted with great diligence, and with all available care, that I think I have made good progress, having added about two hundred meanings certainly, and one hundred more probably, to the vocabulary already obtained through the Babylonian translations. I estimate the number of words which occur in the Babylonian and Assyrian inscriptions at about five thousand, and I do not pretend to be acquainted with more than a tenth part of that number; but it must be remembered, that the five hundred known words constitute all the most important terms in the language, and are in fact sufficient for the interpretation of the historical inscriptions, and for the general recognition of the object of every record, be it an invocation or dedication, or, as it more frequently happens, be it intended as a mere commemorative legend."*

To two hundred and fifty-two Assyrio-Babylonian signs or characters, Dr Hincks gave three hundred and forty-four phonetic values: as to one hundred and seventy-seven of them, he agreed with Colonel Rawlinson,—he differed with him as to forty-nine. But in many instances the difference consisted only in giving to the terminating vowel the value of E or O, which the colonel ignores, and for which he substitutes either I or U. The remaining one hundred and eighteen values are new, being omitted by the colonel altogether.† Besides, M. Oppert of Paris, in the year 1858, improving upon what went before, gave three hundred and eighteen Assyrio-Babylonian signs or characters, as the forms most commonly in use.‡ And while we write (April 1868), Mr Edwin Norris of London is about to emit a dictionary of the words of the cuneiform inscriptions from the press.§

* "The Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland," Vol. xii. Part. ii. pp. 409, 410. London, 1850.

† "Transactions of the Royal Irish Academy," Vol. xxii. Part iv. p. 363.

‡ "Expedition Scientifique en Mesopotamie," Tom. ii. livre 1; "Appendice, catalogue des signes les plus usites," pp. 107-120,—quoted in Rawlinson's "Five Great Monarchies," Vol. I. p. 337.

§ Announced in the *Athenæum* of 14th March 1868, as about to be published in 4to, by Messrs Williams & Norgate.

Such are the means by which the discipherment and translation of the Assyrio-Babylonian marbles have been effected, and not only the monuments themselves, but the historical and geographical treasures which they contain, have been transferred from the lands of the Tigris and the Euphrates, to the banks of the Seine and the Thames. Thus, in the words of our oriental pioneer, "a commencement has been made; the first outwork has been carried, in a hitherto impregnable position, and that is all."* These words were uttered in 1850. Since then much has been done; and very much still remains to be accomplished. Of this at least there can be no doubt, a gallery, wide and spacious, has been opened up, and that in the right direction. Confessedly, on all hands, the Assyrio-Babylonian is a Semitic language. Like the Hebrew, it is possessed of a definite article; it forms the plurals of its nouns and adjectives, much in the same way; its pronouns have a close similarity; its particles are often the same; its verbs assume similar, and sometimes more extended forms, yet still Semitic; and the suffixes attached to them are distinctly Hebrew. No Hebraist can hear the following Assyrio-Babylonian words, without recognising in their utterance the breath and odour of a Hebrew root:—*Ten*, to give; *Duk*, to smite; *Mit*, to die; *Rad*, to go down; *El*, to go up; *Kun*, to appoint; *Sib*, to dwell; *Men*, to allot; *Am*, a mother; *Bar*, a son; *Beth*, a house. No mere conjectural system of alphabetic or syllabic signs could account for all those established facts and linguistic peculiarities. "At the same time," says Professor Rawlinson, "the language has peculiarities of its own, which separate it from its kindred tongue, and constitute it a distinct form of Semitic speech, not a mere variety of any known form. It is neither Hebrew, nor Arabic, nor Phœnician, nor Chaldee, nor Syriac, but a sister tongue to these, having some analogies with all of them, and others, more or fewer, with each. On the whole, its closest relationship seems to be with the Hebrew, and its greatest divergence from the Arabic or Syriac, with which it was yet, locally, in immediate connection."†

And, here let us add, that with all its initiatory difficulties, the cultivation of this old language, now revived, is not more difficult than the cultivation of many of the multifarious languages of India. In addition to sixty simple letters, Sanscrit requires four hundred or five hundred compound ones; indeed,

* "Sir Henry Rawlinson on the Inscriptions of Assyria and Babylonia," *Journal of Royal Asiatic Society*, Vol. xii. Part ii. p. 409.

† "The Five Great Monarchies of the Ancient Eastern World," by George Rawlinson, M.A., Camden Professor of Ancient History in the University of Oxford, &c., Vol. i. p. 341.

no fount of types would be found practicable, without one or two hundreds more of different kinds. And if, for the end of advancement in the civil service, or from the love of literature, Englishmen have been found spending thirty or forty years, or an entire lifetime, in the study of the divine alphabet of the Brahmins, or the not over modest dramas of their sacred tongue, is it too much to expect that in some rural rectory, or Scottish manse, or amid the cloisters of some comfortable fellowship, or within the hallowed shade of some episcopal palace, the *mens divinator* may kindle up, and alighting on the language of Terah and Abram, and Nimrod and Nebuchadnezzar, rise with a noble ardour in the service of the King of kings? We are verily persuaded that, as the use of the Roman character has accelerated the study of the diversified languages of the Hindoo, so by the transfusion of the arrow-heads of Assyria into the letters employed by the Hebrews in writing their sacred books, since returning from the captivity,—letters which were also the cursive characters of their conquerors,—the study of the Assyrian monuments would be intensified and advanced; and it would be as common for a scholar to translate an inscription of Nineveh or Babylon, as it is for an English lady to read a chapter in Hebrew from the book of Genesis. What the Roman letter has done, and is still doing, for the languages of India, the Hebrew letter will, in due season, do for all the arrow-headed inscriptions of the Semitic type. The Lion of the tribe of Judah must prevail. “The kingdoms of this world shall become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ.”

The Assyrian language, therefore, being so closely allied to our Biblical Hebrew, we cherish the pleasing hope that, in a few years, in our English and Scottish universities, it will be no unusual thing for a professor of Oriental languages, who is a proficient in Hebrew, and Chaldee, and Syriac, and Arabic, and Persic, to add the Assyrian, and enlighten his students by bringing a clay tablet, or a cuneiform plate from the British Museum, and thence confirm an historical statement from the books of Kings, or of Chronicles, or establish a prediction from Isaiah or Ezekiel. And although the theological student, rapt with more spiritual musings, may not use the condescension, or enjoy the leisure, to study the old Persian or the Scythic duplicates, on the Achamenian tablets at Persepolis, or Pasargadae, or Hamadan, or the Lake Van, or the rock of Behistun, it will be perfectly within the line of his education, and much to his improvement, to rise from reading a chapter in Chaldee from Daniel or Nehemiah, or one in Hebrew from Nahum or Jonah, to explore the kindred records of the Assyrian in the arrow-heads of Kalah-Sherghat, or Nimrúd, or Karamles, or Kouyunjik, or Khorsabad, the scat-

tered *debris* of the imperial Nineveh, or as transfused into the cursive characters of the captives that hung their harps on the willows of Babylon. Why should it not be so? What more than one of our laymen have already done, shall it be deemed impracticable for our theologians to accomplish? The "Phaleg and Canaan," for example, that grand commentary on the tenth chapter of Genesis, drawn out by Samuel Bochart, the plain presbyter of Caen, is a fine exhibition of comparative philology and comprehensive geography, and, establishing the authenticity of the Mosaic record on the very names and existences of nations, stands out as a beacon to the truth of the Pentateuch, engraven in the nomenclature and dialects and migrations of all the tribes of men, continuous and durable as the race itself, and holding out to the earnest inquirer into the antiquities of the first settlers on the plain of Shinar, one of the completest specimens of exact learning brought to bear upon the principles of inductive ethnology. No aspirant of literary fame, or theological honours, need certainly be ashamed of that splendid work, emanating from so humble an individual. The chapter on the *Toldoth beni Noah*, as recorded by Moses, is the storehouse of antiquarians and ethnologists in every age, from the Babylonian Berosus to Dr James Cowles Prichard, and Sir Henry Creswicke Rawlinson. It connects history with theology, and is specially the province of the divine. We are sorry, however, to find no less a man than Dr Alexander Murray, speaking of that genealogical catalogue, with a levity unworthy of a scholar so distinguished, and so good a man. But his great work is posthumous: had his life been prolonged, we believe that such a sentiment would not have seen the light.* Yet the study in itself is fascinating; and is it for a moment to be doubted, that the same genius that dwelt in the shepherd boy of Dun-Kitterick, as he fed his sheep on the hills of Galloway, and accompanying him to the country manse in the parish of Urr, enabled him to translate what none of the *literati* in Britain could then decipher, the letter in Abyssinian sent to the king of England,—still lives in the breasts of some of our ingenuous youth, in rural homestead, or straw-thatched cottage, destined to be the future lights and glory of their country? Whatever others may think of the times in which we live—

" Though fallen on evil days,
On evil days though fallen, and evil tongues ;"

we will not, for a moment, fold our hands in apathy, or despair

* "History of the European Languages, or Researches into the Affinities of the Teutonic, Greek, Celtic, Slavonic, and Indian Nations." By the late Alexander Murray, D.D., Professor of Oriental Languages in the University of Edinburgh. Edinburgh, 1823. See Vol. i. p. 178, and Vol. ii. p. 434.

that, at an era not far distant, this hope for the rising generation of our fatherland will one day be realised.

Among the more recent discoveries in connection with the monuments of Assyria, we may mention, that in the ninth year of the annals of Shalmaneser II., the name given doubtfully as "Ainab of Sambala" has been identified as "Ahab of Jezreel;" and that, in the ninth year of the reign of Asshur-danin-il II., king of Assyria, an eclipse, which must have taken place B.C. 763, is said to be recorded in an Assyrian tablet. By the former discovery, Ahab (B.C. 853), not Jehu (B.C. 841), is now ascertained to be the first king of Israel mentioned in the Monuments of Assyria.* As for the tablet, in relation to the eclipse, we quote the words of Professor Rawlinson:—

"An important discovery," says he, "has been made, bearing upon the subject of Assyrian chronology. This is the record of a solar eclipse in the ninth year of Asshur-danin-il II., which took place in the month Sivan, or June, and which, from the prominence assigned to it on the tablet where it is recorded, we must presume to have been total. The calculations of astronomers shew that the total eclipse falling at this time of year, visible in Assyria, between B.C. 847 and B.C. 647 (within which period the reign of Asshur-danin-il II. must certainly have fallen), was one on June 15, B.C. 768. This eclipse commenced before noon, was total, and was visible all over Western Asia. There can be no doubt that it is the one recorded upon the tablet. This discovery gives a certainty, equal to that possessed by astronomical science, to the whole range of Assyrian chronology from B.C. 909 to B.C. 665. It is remarkable that it *makes only the alteration of a single year* in the schemes of dates previously given in this work, which had for its basis a combination of the Assyrian canon and the canon of Ptolemy."

To these words, the Professor adds, in a note,—"There can be little doubt that this eclipse is the one of which Amos prophesied" (Amos viii. 9).†

We must confess that we are disposed to pause here for a little, and acknowledge the difficulty of the subject. Chronology is the *bête noir* of antiquarians and ethnologists. It runs wild in the territory of profane history, and makes inroads upon that which is sacred. Ctesias and Herodotus, our two oldest of uninspired authorities in relation to Assyria, differ in their chronology by eight hundred years. In like manner, we find, in the ablest of recent investigators, no small disagreement as to the chronology of Egypt,—

"Lepsius agrees with Bunsen," says Sir George Cornewall Lewis, "that Sesostris on the Manethonian list, who stands in the twelfth

* "The Five Great Monarchies of the Ancient Eastern World." By George Rawlinson, M.A., &c. Vol. III., pp. 361-2.

† "The Five Great Monarchies," &c. Vol. IV., p. 578.

dynasty, at 3320 B.C., is not Sesostris; but it is to the third dynasty, brings him down to the first, identifies him with Sethos, 1826 B.C.—one called the old, the other to what is called the new; the respective dates by an interval of 3793 years. Think if a new school of writers on the history of France, themselves Francologists, were to arise, in which critics were to deny that Louis XIV. lived in the seventeenth century, were to identify him with Hercules or Romulus the Great, or Caesar or Charlemagne; while at the same school, agreeing in the rejection of Louis XIV. as to his being the successor of Louis XIII., would Napoleon I. and Louis Napoleon? ”*

Is it quite impossible that anything similar in the decipherment and interpretation of the characters of Nineveh? We speak with respect. The Egyptologists proceed by numbers, the Assyrians go the length of decades only. In the second book of Kings, in the English and Hebrew text, without one different reading in Kennicott or De Rossi, confirmed by the Vulgate, the Septuagint, the Arabic, the Syriac stands strongly out in opposition to the Hebrew. It is certainly possible that a corruption, at a certain point, have crept into the Hebrew text (for such corruptions have confessedly occurred, more particularly for numerals), and thus run through all the copies. And, in such a case, we should only realize the error of the transcriber, whilst our faith in the infallible penman, and his original text, literally remains intact. But, on the other hand, is it not possible to say, far more—possible, that the error is in the Assyrian canon itself? For how stands the evidence of the copies of that *terra cotta* document in the British Museum, and mutilated as they all are, they do not where legible, agree with one another. The Assyrian canon itself grants this.† In proportion, then, that the Assyrian canon differ from one another, they do not confirm but diminish their own value. And granting that the Assyrian record is correct, that an eclipse actually did take place within the limits of the canon; or, that the Sun, with other superstitious notices of the

* Sir George C. Lewis, in his “Astronomy of the Bible.”

† In his communication to the *Athenæum*, May 31, 1867.

‡ See *Athenæum*, May 18, 1867, p. 661.

of in his physical and not his religious capacity; or that in transcribing the names, or marking the lines, of annual superintendents, during the course of 243 years, the short note of an eclipse of the sun has not been misplaced by—whom shall we say—the Median, the Persian, the Babylonian, the Assyrian, or the Scythic scribe? We put these questions, which we deem natural; and we do so in the spirit of deferential inquiry and respect. We now quote the words of Dr Hincks, a man in those studies certainly of no mean authority:—

“Is there *any* rectification,” says Dr Hincks, “of the received Hebrew numbers rendered necessary by any recent discovery? I do not think that there is. What requires rectification is, it appears to me, the canon of which Sir Henry Rawlinson has given an account; or, perhaps I should rather say, it is Sir Henry Rawlinson’s edition of the canon. It is my decided opinion that he has not placed a single one of the Eponymes [or superintendents] in connection with his proper year. He has assumed a wrong year for the Eponymy [or superintendency] of Sargon, and his error as to this affects every Eponymy in the whole canon. He has also omitted to allow for an interval of some fifty years, during which the appointment of Eponymes [or superintendents] was suspended, after the conquest of Assyria by Arbaces and Belesis.”

Again,—

“The mean difference, therefore, between the accession of Shalmaneser II. and the Eponymy [or superintendency] of Tiglath Pileser, according to the second book of Kings, and according to the Assyrian canon, is 44 years, with a possible error, more or less, of 14 years. The difference cannot be made less than 30 years, without disturbing numbers that are linked together in an unexceptionable manner; and I do say that, taking the Hebrew book, entitled the Second Book of Kings, as a merely human composition, building nothing on its forming part of the Bible, or its having any claim to inspiration, it is *far more* worthy of credit than this Assyrian canon. Every principle of sound criticism requires us to suppose that the compiler of the canon has passed over a period of upwards of 30 years, during which either no Eponymes were appointed, or he was unable to discover their names.”*

We allow those words to speak for themselves. It is, however, but justice to add, that Mr Bosanquet has, in opposition to Dr Hincks and M. Oppert, come to the support of the Rawlinsonian view of the Assyrian canon, in a long and elaborate paper in the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society,† in which, if he does not accomplish his object, it is not certainly from the lack of either learning or research.

* See Dr Hinck’s communication to *Athenæum* of July 5. 1862, entitled “Bible History and the Rawlinson Canon.”

† New Series, Vol. I., part 1st, pp 145–180.

But the Rev. George Rawlinson, Camden Professor of Ancient History in the University of Oxford, tells us in a note in the fourth volume of his "Five Great Monarchies of the Ancient Eastern World,"* that "there can be little doubt that this eclipse," viz., June 15. B.C. 763, "is the one of which Amos prophesied" (Amos viii. 9). Let us quote the words of the prophet at length, "And it shall come to pass in that day, said the Lord God, that I will cause the sun to go down at noon, and I will darken the earth in the clear day." It may be that these words predict a literal eclipse of the sun; although, we are convinced, that is the least thing here, if at all intended; for the context points to something darker than a mere solar eclipse; "there shall be many dead bodies in every place" (v. 3); the Lord "will send a famine in the land, not a famine of bread, nor a thirst for water, but of hearing the words of the Lord" (v. 11). It is not usually the province of a prophet to predict what any astronomer may calculate. Under the emblem of the going down of the sun, a revolution in the state is indicated. Besides, if, as the Rawlinson canon demands, forty years are to be elided between the first year of Ahab and the first year of Hezekiah; and, as Amos prophesied within that period, viz., in the reigns of Uzziah, king of Judah, and Jeroboam II., king of Israel, the elision of the forty years, according as it is placed before the days of Uzziah and Jeroboam II. or after them, will make the prediction of Amos precede the eclipse, or the eclipse precede the prediction. The fulfilment of the prediction has, therefore, by interpreters of high repute,† been referred to the temporary prosperity of Israel under Jeroboam II., suddenly clouded by the murder of his son Zachariah, after a short reign of six months, and quickly followed by the invasion of Pul, king of Assyria, and many evils (compare 2 Kings xiv. 24-29, with 2 Kings xv. 8-37). That was the sun's eclipse. In fact, as Rosenmüller rightly judgeth, "just as the darkening of the sun denotes very heavy calamities, so the heaviest of all are usually indicated by its setting, whence it is altogether withdrawn from the earth."‡

In making these remarks, we do not profess to be either discoverers or inventors, we simply endeavour to mark the

* See page 573.

† Munster, Vatablus, Castalio, Clarius, Drusius, Grotius, Pool, Gill, Henderson. In relation to the subject of a total eclipse of the sun, Hitzig sums up the matter characteristically thus, "Dass aber gerade in Jerobeams Todesjahr eine solche gefallen, dass einige Ausleger diese hier geweissagt sein lassen, und dass ein Grieche sie vorausberechnet habe (*Justi*), dafür vermisse ich jeglichen Beweis."

‡ "Uti autem obscuratio solis graviores calamitates indicat (vid. e. c. Ezech. xxxii. 7, 8), ita gravissimæ per occasum, quo penitus teris subducitur, innuunt."—*Rosenmüller*, in Amos viii. 9.

footsteps of those eminent men who have invented and discovered, and we desire it to be distinctly understood, that whatever on some points may be our opinion, as to the results drawn from some Assyrian inscriptions, we regard the four volumes of Professor Rawlinson on "*The Five Great Monarchies of the Ancient Eastern World*," as a work of rare learning and labour, full of antiquarian lore and recondite detail, and the fruits of modern travel and discovery; and if some of the conclusions must be considered as only provisional, awaiting the judicial adjustment of further light, he must still be regarded as having purposed and accomplished a task of no small magnificence, and vindicated, as his own, the words of another great historian, "*prorsus rem magni et animi et corporis aggressus*."* In perusing his luminous and massy tomes, we feel as though the angel Michael had reassumed the kind offices that the poet tells us that he performed, on the ruin of our race, to our first father, and had wafted us to some

. . . "Hill
Of Paradise the highest, from whose top
The hemisphere of earth in clearest ken,
Stretch'd out to the amplest reach of prospect, lay."

Or;

. . . "Like stout Cortez, when with eagle eyes
He star'd at the Pacific, and all his men
Looked at each other with a wild surmise,
Silent upon a peak in Darien."

And if one single word of ours could, amidst the utilitarian predilections of this iron age, have the effect of encouraging and cheering on, in the path of studious research, those noble spirits that have done so much already for the decipherment of cuneiform writing, to proceed with their laudable zeal and generous aspirations, we would call upon men with such names and accomplishments as those of Grotefend, and Lassen, and Burnouf, and Hincks, and Rawlinson, and Oppert, and Talbot,—or, whilst some of those veterans fall in the field,—on spirits fired with an ambition similar to theirs, to advance in the high walk of ancient history and oriental literature,—to shed the light of knowledge on the nations and languages, the countries and migrations of the human race,—to unroll secrets that have been kept hid in the archives of oldest and mightiest monarchies,—to disclose the primitive origin, and close connection, and early brotherhood of nations,—to elucidate the historic truth and heavenly purity and grandeur of the Hebrew scriptures; and, from war and bloodshed, from sanctioned uncleanness, and the worship of Bel, and Nebo, and Merodach,

* Justini in "*Trogi Pompeii historias exordium*."

and Ashtarte, to teach the children of
 spot,—Ur of the Chaldees,—whence Abr
 was called, and, like him, to embrace
 given to the Chaldean wanderer by the
 seed shall all the nations of the earth be

ART. VI.—*The Christian Doc*

The Christian Doctrine of Sin. By Dr JULIUS M
 logy in the University of Halle. Translated
 Fifth Edition. By the Rev. WILLIAM URWIC
 Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 38 George St
 Adams, & Co. Dublin: J. Robertson & Co

DR MÜLLER is a man of distinguis
 ranked amongst the sounder class c
 This work, on which his high reputatio
 and America, mainly rests, is worthy o
 and studied. The subjects to which it i
 sin, the freedom of the will, the universa
 human nature, and the source whence it
 the most profound and important that c
 man. Written with much fulness and
 us with the varied phases of modern
 debated especially in Germany, whose
 now exerts an influence so powerful on t
 Britain. It illustrates, vindicates, and
 a new and more interesting light, many i
 it successfully combats many errors whic
 of all religion; and it brings to bear on e
 no common metaphysical and logical
 large extent controversial, it is pervaded
 sophical calmness and candour of spirit,
 of deep religious earnestness. Its style i
 and vigorous, such as is exceedingly wel
 phical discussion, though, of course, the re
 close attention. So popular has it becom
 fifth edition has been published, and tha
 as a text-book in many of the universitie

But while paying willing tribute to th
 gical merits of this performance, we c
 sentiments which it propounds, nor adm
 its interpretations of Scripture. On so

displays more subtilty of mind than solidity of judgment ; a greater tendency to indulge in fanciful speculations than to rest his conclusions on the basis of well ascertained premises. When he deviates from the old paths, and strikes out new ones, by altering, modifying, or supplanting what has been long received, he is more remarkable for placing, in a strong light, the difficulties or objections which have been started against the old doctrines, than for his power and success in establishing his own opinions, or in meeting and answering the still more formidable objections by which they may be assailed. On some of these opinions, we propose briefly to animadvert ; and passing over the first volume, which treats chiefly of the nature of sin, we shall limit ourselves to the second, in which the great subjects are—the freedom of the will, the universality of inborn depravity, and the source whence it is derived.

The author divides freedom of the will into *real* and *formal*. Real freedom of the will is what belongs to a moral intelligent being in its most perfect state. Then only is man in the highest sense free, when, without hesitation, he *wills* only what is good, and carries out in act that inner necessity of his nature, which excludes even the thought of the possibility of sin. But this view of freedom of the will, which the author holds to be just, does not answer the object which he proposes, which is to discover, in beings possessed of personality, some condition of sufficient strength and independence to enable them to make an entirely new beginning in action—in fact to originate sin—and thus to exempt evil from the divine causation. “In order to solve this difficulty, there must,” he observes, “it would seem, be in the freedom of the will some power whereby evil as well as good can be produced. Such a power does exist ; the power of choosing between good and evil essentially belongs to human nature ;” and this the author designates *formal freedom*. “But real freedom and formal freedom,” he observes, “are so related and harmonised, that, correctly speaking, they are not two conceptions of freedom, but different stages of the same, the first being only a stage which is intended to pass on towards the full realisation of freedom.”

Applying this formal freedom to man in his primitive state, and excluding the idea of the self-determining power of the will, as involved in it, the will being determined by motives, we have an explanation of how sin entered into the world without the divine causation. But applying it to man in his present fallen condition, it must be observed, that from the depravity of his moral nature, he has no power to choose or to do what is really good in the sight of God, for the will always acts according to the impulse of the moral disposition of the

agent, while yet his free agency remains ; and that he must be renewed by the grace of God, before he can choose and do what is truly good in the estimation of God.

It is further important here to note, that real freedom, which consists in choosing only what is good from an inner necessity of nature, excluding even the possibility of sin, can, in the highest and strictest sense, be attributed only to God. In an inferior sense, it belongs to the holy angels, and to the righteous when they attain to a higher state—"the glorious liberty of the children of God ;" but it is not essential to them as it is to God, nor does it arise from the fact of their having acquired a perfected nature, nor is it the result merely of the "progress of moral development," as Müller has it, as if by this means they attained to a self-sufficiency to preserve themselves in a state of perfection, but it is the effect of the unremitting communication of influences from God. Thus it must be from their necessarily absolute dependence upon him, which excludes the idea that their need of the communication of his influences, and their dependence upon him in their actings, should cease after he has brought them to this state of perfected freedom.

To some of the statements made by the author, on the subject of the freedom of the divine will, which he investigates under different aspects, and in its various relations, we would more particularly make objection. He thus writes :—

"God is what he is wholly by self-determination. . . . All truths, even those which we call necessary, and the denial of which would violate all consecutive thought—the fundamental truths of mathematics and metaphysics—have their ultimate basis in the absolute self-determination of God as the original source of all reality. . . . God, in the original basis of his existence, is *nothing but* WILL and FREEDOM. This original will is eternally the source of an infinite fulness of being in God himself, for it wills only life and love. . . . Every attribute of the divine nature—and therefore love—springs from the divine self-determination. Assuredly God is love, because he wills to be love."—(Vol. II. pp. 129, 130, 132, 136.)

These affirmations, that God is what he is by self-determination, and that his will is the basis of truth, are conclusions which the author draws from a manner of expression or of thought concerning God's absolute dependence upon himself alone, amounting to this, that God is the cause of himself, meaning thereby "that all the determinations of God's essence have for their principle and basis his absolute will ;" and he quotes with approval the words of Lactantius, that "God is from himself, and therefore he is such as he wills himself to be ;" and the words of Jerome, "God himself is the origin of himself, and the cause of his own substance" (Vol. II. p. 129).

These fathers, we conceive, in thus speaking, darken counsel by words without knowledge. God is a being who necessarily exists, not caused by himself nor by any other being, but existing by a simple absolute necessity. We are, indeed, aware, that theological writers, in using these and similar terms, which seem to apply self-origination to God, understand them as meaning, not positively, that God gave existence to himself, or is self-originated, but negatively, that he did not receive his existence from any other; and they imagine that such language, though not logically or metaphysically exact, expresses the sense intended to be conveyed better than can be done by other terms. But such language has really no meaning when applied to the eternal, uncaused, independent, and necessarily existing Jehovah. From the absolute dependence of God upon himself alone, it does not follow, as Dr Müller argues, that his absolute will is the principle of the determinations of his essence—is, for example, the principle of his determination of mathematical, metaphysical, or moral truth. So far as mathematical truth is concerned, the objection of Professor Zeller to Dr Müller's theory, that "three times three might have been ten, if God had only willed it so," is well founded, and Dr Müller only gets quit of the objection, by saying that "mathematical truths are beyond a doubt a revelation of the eternal order and harmony of the divine nature;" an affirmation which embodies a principle subversive of his theory, and yet he asserts, as if retracting even this concession, that "a different standard is neither affirmed nor denied."

In regard to moral truth, it has its foundation, not in the will of God, but in his nature. Dr Chalmers, in objecting to the system of Dr Paley, which resolves virtue "not into any native or independent rightness of its own, but into the will of God," observes, "Virtue hath a higher original than the will of God, even the character of God, or those principles in the constitution of the Deity which give direction to his will."* The will of God does not determine the nature of virtue, and constitute its essence and measure. Righteousness and holiness are essential to the constitution of his nature, and his freedom of will develops itself in accordance with his own character. Moral truth is thus founded, not on the will of God, but on his nature, which is the ultimate standard of all that is virtuous and good. The will of God, and the rightness of what he wills, are distinct elements of thought. They cannot be separated, nor can they ever be antagonistic in the divine mind, for, from his absolute perfection, his will must always be in harmony with the righteousness and holiness of his nature; but it will help to accuracy

* "Chalmers' Works," Vol. V., p. 419.

~~the~~ I ~~in~~ ~~receptions~~, whilst

10-11-1961

which represents all
fitness or

... of business or
... character,

~~_____~~ _____ and meta-

~~_____~~ and meta-
The moral

The moral
is that's all right

THE NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY
ASTOR LENOX TILDEN FOUNDATION
455 FIFTH AVENUE
NEW YORK 17, N. Y.

...and the Lord God ...

1. The first group of people who are interested in the study of the history of the United States are the people who are interested in the history of the United States.

1. The first step is to identify the problem or question that needs to be answered. This involves understanding the context and the specific information required.

7-12 2025 20

1. The first step in the process is to identify the problem or issue that needs to be addressed. This involves gathering information and understanding the context of the problem.

1. The first step in the process is to identify the problem or issue that needs to be addressed. This involves gathering information and understanding the context of the problem.

1. The first group of people who are not in the labor force are those who are not in the labor force because they are not in the labor force.

— — — — —

— — — — —

[illegible]

...and the fact that the *Journal* is a journal of the American Psychological Association, the largest and most influential of the professional organizations in the field of psychology, is a source of great strength and authority. The *Journal* is a journal of the American Psychological Association, the largest and most influential of the professional organizations in the field of psychology, is a source of great strength and authority.

1. The first group of respondents (Group 1) consisted of 100 individuals who were randomly selected from a list of all employees of the company. This group was surveyed in the first quarter of 2018.

2. The second group of respondents (Group 2) consisted of 100 individuals who were randomly selected from a list of all employees of the company. This group was surveyed in the second quarter of 2018.

3. The third group of respondents (Group 3) consisted of 100 individuals who were randomly selected from a list of all employees of the company. This group was surveyed in the third quarter of 2018.

4. The fourth group of respondents (Group 4) consisted of 100 individuals who were randomly selected from a list of all employees of the company. This group was surveyed in the fourth quarter of 2018.

5. The fifth group of respondents (Group 5) consisted of 100 individuals who were randomly selected from a list of all employees of the company. This group was surveyed in the first quarter of 2019.

6. The sixth group of respondents (Group 6) consisted of 100 individuals who were randomly selected from a list of all employees of the company. This group was surveyed in the second quarter of 2019.

7. The seventh group of respondents (Group 7) consisted of 100 individuals who were randomly selected from a list of all employees of the company. This group was surveyed in the third quarter of 2019.

8. The eighth group of respondents (Group 8) consisted of 100 individuals who were randomly selected from a list of all employees of the company. This group was surveyed in the fourth quarter of 2019.

9. The ninth group of respondents (Group 9) consisted of 100 individuals who were randomly selected from a list of all employees of the company. This group was surveyed in the first quarter of 2020.

10. The tenth group of respondents (Group 10) consisted of 100 individuals who were randomly selected from a list of all employees of the company. This group was surveyed in the second quarter of 2020.

11. The eleventh group of respondents (Group 11) consisted of 100 individuals who were randomly selected from a list of all employees of the company. This group was surveyed in the third quarter of 2020.

12. The twelfth group of respondents (Group 12) consisted of 100 individuals who were randomly selected from a list of all employees of the company. This group was surveyed in the fourth quarter of 2020.

13. The thirteenth group of respondents (Group 13) consisted of 100 individuals who were randomly selected from a list of all employees of the company. This group was surveyed in the first quarter of 2021.

14. The fourteenth group of respondents (Group 14) consisted of 100 individuals who were randomly selected from a list of all employees of the company. This group was surveyed in the second quarter of 2021.

15. The fifteenth group of respondents (Group 15) consisted of 100 individuals who were randomly selected from a list of all employees of the company. This group was surveyed in the third quarter of 2021.

16. The sixteenth group of respondents (Group 16) consisted of 100 individuals who were randomly selected from a list of all employees of the company. This group was surveyed in the fourth quarter of 2021.

17. The seventeenth group of respondents (Group 17) consisted of 100 individuals who were randomly selected from a list of all employees of the company. This group was surveyed in the first quarter of 2022.

18. The eighteenth group of respondents (Group 18) consisted of 100 individuals who were randomly selected from a list of all employees of the company. This group was surveyed in the second quarter of 2022.

19. The nineteenth group of respondents (Group 19) consisted of 100 individuals who were randomly selected from a list of all employees of the company. This group was surveyed in the third quarter of 2022.

20. The twentieth group of respondents (Group 20) consisted of 100 individuals who were randomly selected from a list of all employees of the company. This group was surveyed in the fourth quarter of 2022.

1. The first step in the process is to identify the problem or issue that needs to be addressed. This involves gathering information and understanding the context of the problem.

— *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 1997

[illegible]

— *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 1990

[illegible][illegible]

1. The first group of people who are not in the labor force are those who are not in the labor force because they are not in the labor force. This group is the largest group of people who are not in the labor force.

...the

[illegible]

...the

1. The first step in the process is to identify the problem or issue that needs to be addressed. This involves gathering information and understanding the context of the problem.

... ..

...the

1. The first step in the process is to identify the problem or issue that needs to be addressed. This involves gathering information and understanding the context of the problem.

— *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 1967, 201: 1031-1032

100-443887-100

[illegible]

Age Group	Percentage of Respondents
18-29	65
30-49	70
50-69	75
70+	88

Figure 1 is a line graph showing the percentage of respondents who believe that the use of force is justified in various circumstances. The x-axis represents the percentage of respondents who believe that the use of force is justified in the circumstances. The y-axis represents the percentage of respondents who believe that the use of force is justified in the circumstances. The graph shows a positive correlation between the two variables.

—it is not our guilt, but our misfortune. And even as to actual sins which spring from this inherent sinful tendency, these are not strictly our own, but the acts of our first parents through us. Why, then, should deeds, which are only apparently ours, be imputed to us as actual sins for which we are to be condemned? . . . A personal being alone can be regarded as the real author of its acts and states. Where there is no personality, and consequently no freedom of will, there can be no power of primary self-determination. . . . Christian dogma demands that personal guilt must be maintained as attaching both to inherited sinfulness and to its fruits in our life; and so far as we have yet seen, there is no way of reconciling this with the contradictory conclusion now argued out. This recoil of the consciousness of guilt against the idea of hereditary sin is so obvious, that the opponents of the Augustinian doctrine, from Pelagius downwards, have considered it their main argument.”—(Vol. II., pp. 809, 810.)

Is this objection, then, which we have given in its full strength, sufficient to overthrow the old doctrine of the Christian Church, that the natural depravity of the human family is hereditary, and that it takes its rise from Adam? We think not. If the word of God, which alone can supply us with authentic information on this important question, fully establishes, as we believe it does, that inherent human depravity has its origin in the apostacy of Adam, and in it alone, that fact is to be received on the testimony of God, whatever may be the difficulties of explaining or answering objections that may be raised against some parts of the economy or dispensation by which this has taken place. It is, therefore, important, in dealing with Dr Müller's objection, to prove that the inborn sinfulness of the human race is in the Scriptures traced to Adam as its origin, exclusive of every other source.

This truth is established from Genesis v. 3, where it is said that Adam “begat a son in his own likeness after his image.” The marked contrast between the image of God in which Adam was created, as recorded in the first chapter of that book, and the image of Adam in which Seth was born, is worthy of notice. The image of God in which Adam was created, consisted chiefly in knowledge, righteousness, and true holiness. But after his fall, he acquired a state of mind and will, a disposition and character, the opposite of that in which he was created; and this disposition and character, this fallen nature, became inherent and hereditary in his descendants. “He begat a son in his own likeness after his image,” which cannot be understood physically, as denoting merely likeness in form, figure, and lineaments, but morally, relating to the mind, being contrasted with the image of God in which he was created. Adam, then, transmitted to his children the fallen nature which he himself had acquired by his apostacy. Dr Müller endeavours to

of thought to view them as distinct in our conceptions, whilst to confound them may bewilder and perplex.

We object, then, to Dr Müller's theory, which represents all truth as originating, not in any native or necessary fitness or rightness of its own, founded in the divine nature and character, but in the will of God. The axioms of mathematics and metaphysical truths are not true because he willed them. The moral law, which enjoins love to God and to our fellow men, is not right because he willed it. Holiness is not holiness, and sin is not sin, because he willed them to be so. Instead of saying, "God is love because he wills to be love," we would say, what is more in accordance, at once with the Scriptures and with the principles of right reason, God is love because it is inherent in his nature,—in his moral disposition, which consists, not only of righteousness and holiness, but of goodness, grace, and mercy.

Dr Müller establishes with admirable eloquence and power the doctrine of the universality of the corruption of human nature, proving that sin is a permanent defilement and corruption of the heart, manifest in various sinful acts, which spring therefrom; "that an inborn bias towards evil is deep-rooted in human nature;" that, therefore, "the old theological expression original sin, understanding it as simply affirming the existence of an innate tendency or bias towards sin in every human being, is fully justified; and that this inborn depravity is not only an evil and a sickness, that it entails GUILT on him in whom it is" (vol. ii., pp. 259, 267, 268, 274, 279). To these statements we cordially subscribe. But when he comes to investigate the question of the *origin* of inborn human depravity, he becomes unsatisfactory. To trace this depravity to Adam and to him alone, as has been done by the Reformers and the Evangelical Churches, he regards as a very inadequate solution. Its derivation from Adam he admits only very partially, so partially indeed, that it amounts to little or nothing, in considering the question; and he attributes it mainly to the fall of the souls of the human race in a pre-existent state. These questions we shall severally consider, endeavouring to abbreviate our observations as much as possible.

Dr Müller's great objection against the doctrine of the derivation of the inherent depravity of human nature from Adam, is an old and oft repeated objection, that on this principle there is an irreconcilable contradiction between two acknowledged facts, the inborn depravity of mankind and the personal guiltiness involved therein. The objection he states in the following terms:—

"If this sinful tendency be in us solely through the acts of others, and not through our own deed, *they* and not *we* are responsible for it,

—it is not our guilt, but our misfortune. And even as to actual sins which spring from this inherent sinful tendency, these are not strictly our own, but the acts of our first parents through us. Why, then, should deeds, which are only apparently ours, be imputed to us as actual sins for which we are to be condemned? . . . A personal being alone can be regarded as the real author of its acts and states. Where there is no personality, and consequently no freedom of will, there can be no power of primary self-determination. . . . Christian dogma demands that personal guilt must be maintained as attaching both to inherited sinfulness and to its fruits in our life; and so far as we have yet seen, there is no way of reconciling this with the contradictory conclusion now argued out. This recoil of the consciousness of guilt against the idea of hereditary sin is so obvious, that the opponents of the Augustinian doctrine, from Pelagius downwards, have considered it their main argument.”—(Vol. II., pp. 309, 310.)

Is this objection, then, which we have given in its full strength, sufficient to overthrow the old doctrine of the Christian Church, that the natural depravity of the human family is hereditary, and that it takes its rise from Adam? We think not. If the word of God, which alone can supply us with authentic information on this important question, fully establishes, as we believe it does, that inherent human depravity has its origin in the apostacy of Adam, and in it alone, that fact is to be received on the testimony of God, whatever may be the difficulties of explaining or answering objections that may be raised against some parts of the economy or dispensation by which this has taken place. It is, therefore, important, in dealing with Dr Müller's objection, to prove that the inborn sinfulness of the human race is in the Scriptures traced to Adam as its origin, exclusive of every other source.

This truth is established from Genesis v. 3, where it is said that Adam “begat a son in his own likeness after his image.” The marked contrast between the image of God in which Adam was created, as recorded in the first chapter of that book, and the image of Adam in which Seth was born, is worthy of notice. The image of God in which Adam was created, consisted chiefly in knowledge, righteousness, and true holiness. But after his fall, he acquired a state of mind and will, a disposition and character, the opposite of that in which he was created; and this disposition and character, this fallen nature, became inherent and hereditary in his descendants. “He begat a son in his own likeness after his image,” which cannot be understood physically, as denoting merely likeness in form, figure, and lineaments, but morally, relating to the mind, being contrasted with the image of God in which he was created. Adam, then, transmitted to his children the fallen nature which he himself had acquired by his apostacy. Dr Müller endeavours to

nullify the force of this text, as a proof of the transmission of the inborn depravity of our race from Adam, by a brief but very unsatisfactory exegetical process. "As in Genesis v. 1." he observes, "it is said of Adam, 'in the likeness of God made HE him,' and again, without the least hint of a change, in ver. 3, 'Adam begat a son in his likeness, after his image,' the fair inference is, that Adam's son also bore God's image and likeness." But was there really no change in Adam from the time he was created by God in the divine image, to the time when he begat this son? Had not the fall, which is so minutely recorded by the inspired writer, intervened? and will it be maintained that the fall made no change on Adam's nature, and though thereby he did not lose every fragment of the divine image, yet, that a wholly new element, that of sin, had not entered and become a part of his constitution, rendering him a very different person from what he was when he came fresh from the hand of his Creator? This depravity of nature, which the children of Adam derived from him, and from him alone, they again transmitted to their offspring. They, too, begat children in their own likeness after their image; and this inherited depravity filled the earth with corruption (Gen. vi. 5, and viii. 21), so that in the course of a few generations, the wickedness of mankind became so great, that it "repented the Lord that he had made man upon the earth," and he destroyed the whole race, with the exception of Noah and his family, by an overwhelming deluge.

The same doctrine is expressly affirmed by Job, "Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? not one," Job xiv. 4; by Eliphaz, "What is man that he should be clean? and he that is born of a woman that he should be righteous?" chap. xv. 14; and by Bildad, when he asks, "How then can man be justified with God? or how can he be clean that is born of a woman?" chap. xxv. 4. In these passages impurity is attributed to the race of man universally; not external impurity of body, which can easily be removed by outward appliances, but internal impurity of soul, which is of a character far more inveterate—which is not a mere transient defilement—which is so permanent, that it is engrained in the very nature of every human being born into the world. In one of the chapters quoted, this depravity of human nature is expressed in terms almost as emphatic as language can supply, man being described as "abominable and filthy," and as drinking iniquity, though the most deadly poison, with the greediness with which a thirsty man drinks water. Now Job and his friends expressly tell us that this universal and inveterate corruption of our nature is hereditary, that it is transmitted from parents to their offspring, that men are depraved because they are con-

ceived and born of sinful parents. The race are all contaminated by sin because their parents were so ; and ascending backwards, we can trace this depravity from progenitor to progenitor through all past generations, till we reach the first of the human race, who, by his first sin becoming corrupted in his whole nature, transmitted this corruption to his children, while they, in like manner, transmitted the same inheritance to theirs ; and that depravity, which has been transmitted through all the generations of the species in the past, will be transmitted to the birth of the last member of the human family. To evade the force of these texts, Dr Müller in the first place asserts that the words quoted from the addresses of Eliphaz and Bildad “ may (according to the construction and tenor of the drama), be only exaggerations,” Vol. II. p. 277, which obviously amounts to a denial of the inspiration of the passages. The words of Job alone he considers authoritative, and he admits that they allude “ not only to an inborn but to an inherited uncleanness ;” but he adds that this passage “ affirms nothing as to the question whether the infection be handed down from the beginning of human existence, or whether man at some subsequent time began to be affected by it.” But the concession that the inborn depravity of the race in the time of Job came from *parentage*, really amounts to a concession that it is originally derived from Adam, for in tracing the history of the race up from Job to Adam, it will not be difficult to shew that there is no point in this history when they began to be contaminated with the infection of depravity, till we ascend to the first father of the human family.

In harmony with the preceding declarations of Scripture, David, rising from the consideration of the actual sins he had committed to their source, acknowledges, “ Behold I was shapen in iniquity ; and in sin did my mother conceive me,” Ps. li. 5, language in which also the depravity of human nature is traced to parentage—is asserted to be hereditary—a fallen nature was transmitted to him through his parents even as a fallen nature was transmitted to them. The same fact is affirmed by Christ himself, in his address to Nicodemus, “ That which is born of the flesh is flesh,” John iii. 6—that which is born of man in his present fallen depraved state, which is often expressed in the Scriptures by the word “ flesh,” is flesh—is like him who has given it birth, corrupt and sinful. The limitation of the derivation of our inherent depravity to our being born of a sinful race, is here so express, as to imply the strongest negation of its being derived in any other way. And the necessity of supernatural regeneration by the Spirit, taught in that chapter, supposes that man, through natural generation, had acquired that sinful bias of heart which attaches to our common

nature. The same truth is set forth by the Apostle Paul when he affirms, "By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin." That Adam originated sin among the human family is so obviously the general scope and patent meaning of this text, that it is unnecessary to enter into minute criticism, or to compare the various interpretations which have been put upon it. All the representations of Scripture that have now passed under our review, concerning the transmission of human depravity connect it with parentage, and carry us back to the original ancestor of the human family, and to him alone as the original source.

But while the Scriptures reveal the fact that our inborn depravity is derived from Adam, and from him alone, they also explain the reason of the fact,—how or under what constitution it happened that Adam, and all his natural posterity, became so linked together, that they derive from him in consequence of his apostacy this fatal inheritance. That constitution or dispensation was the covenant of works, into which it pleased God to enter with him when he forbade him to eat of the tree of knowledge of good and evil. The threatening of death as the punishment of disobedience, implied a promise of life as the reward of obedience,—the threatening and the promise being correlative and co-extensive; and this promise, with the condition to be fulfilled, and the necessarily implied consent of Adam, constituted all the essential elements of a proper covenant. In this covenant Adam stood not only for himself, but sustained the character of the public representative of all his natural posterity. Thus God in dealing with him, was dealing with all mankind. The promise and the threatening of the covenant applied to them as well as to him. Had he fulfilled the condition of that covenant, they would have been considered as fulfilling it, and they as well as he would have been put in possession of the life promised, which was comprehensive of all blessings. In like manner, his fall was to be their fall, and was to involve them as well as him in sin and ruin. The corruption of nature which they derive from him, is therefore to be explained, not as has sometimes been done, on the principle of his transmitting as their natural head his own characteristic qualities, even as trees and animals propagate their own characteristic qualities, which would be to represent moral depravity as the result of physical laws, but is to be accounted for from the relation in which they stand to him as the representative of all who have proceeded from his loins.

The universal reign of death is a proof of the constitution now described. Death was introduced by Adam, and it passes upon the whole human family because of their relation to him, Rom. v. 12; 1 Cor. xv. 22. But how could they derive from him death, which is the punishment of sin, unless they had

been considered as having fallen in him when he fell? In opposition to this, it cannot be argued that men die simply for their own actual transgressions, for many infants, who have never committed actual sin, die, and their death can only be explained on the principle for which we contend.

The preceding statements respecting Adam's representative character, are borne out by the contrast made by the Apostle Paul in Rom. v. 12-19, between the relation which Adam and Christ respectively sustained to the race of man, and by virtue of which the one has entailed sin and death upon the whole human family, while the other conveys the blessings of justification and salvation to his people. How, or according to what constitution, then, is it that these different products are communicated? How can we explain this otherwise than upon the principle that Adam and Christ sustained each the character of a public representative, so that the disobedience of the one was reckoned the disobedience of all his natural posterity, while the obedience of those whom Christ represented was accounted their obedience? It is because of the public representative character which each of them sustained to the human race, that Adam is called "the figure of him that was to come," Rom. v. 14, and that Adam is called the "first man" and Christ "the second man," 1 Cor. xv. 47.

Now, if it is admitted that the preceding argument, however imperfectly brought out, presents or suggests data sufficient to establish, from the Scriptures, the fact that our inborn depravity is derived from Adam, it follows, as observed before, that no objection or difficulty, however perplexing, that may be raised against the propriety or reasonableness of the administration of Heaven connected with this fact, can successfully militate against its truth, or should be allowed to unsettle our faith in what the Scriptures have revealed concerning it. Numerous indisputable facts analogous are constantly presenting themselves, which shew that it is a great law of the divine government towards our world, to link the condition of the human race in the way of dependence *morally*, as well as physically, upon one another. We find, for example, that the condition of whole nations, for successive generations, has been as much moulded by those who have preceded them, as if, with the very elements of their being, they had received from them a direct bias towards the particular forms in which ungodliness and wickedness develop themselves; and yet that is not commonly understood as taking away from them all responsibility. We would here only farther observe, that the principle of Dr Müller's objection against the derivation of our depravity from Adam,—namely, that if we derive it from him, solely through his act, not our own, then he and not we are responsible for it,—may be pressed

with equal force against our deriving a substitutionary sufferings and obedience of

But, elaborately as Dr Müller endeavours to reconcile the doctrine of inborn hereditary depravity and the doctrine of the evangelical churches, is derived there is a sense in which he affirms that we inherit depravity from him. He thus unfolds

"Considering the following facts—considering that death over man indicated a disorder in his physical nature—that this disordered state is distinct from the state of the will [this last he, of course, holds to be distinct in souls in a pre-existent state]—that it manifests itself as hereditary and is traceable as a general law [by means] from our first parents, as St Paul cannot doubt that the fall involved a corruption of the psychical life of our first parents—a derangement of the moral nature, which they transmitted, by generation, to their posterity. This derangement of the moral constitution, is the same in all, though individualized in the various races, nations and individuals of mankind. It is a derangement of the bodily tendency in the sensuous nature to suppress the moral spirit, and to rebel against its holy dictates. It is latent, but it is ever present as a depraved disposition, properly so called; it is deeply rooted in the nature and co-determines its character."—(Vol. II., p. 387)

The reader, however, even though the "hereditary sin" in capitals, must not put too much weight upon his words. That the human race are stained by the smallest stain of hereditary sin, that the inborn depravity is derived in any degree from Adam, is inconsistent with the principles laid down by the author. "Sinfulness," says he, "which directly, or in its consequences, can involve guilt [can there be any sinfulness which does not involve guilt?], must have its origin in its own nature, and must maintain, that where there is real guilt, the individual has to answer for before God, it must have free self-decision of the individual, a self-determination of the person's will." These statements are wholly at variance with our author's partial admission, that we derive sinfulness from Adam. He is, indeed, so self-contradictory while he sometimes affirms that we derive sinfulness from Adam, he at other times asserts that we do not. Adam is not properly sin at all; that is, the sinfulness is not derived from Adam, and that we don't derive sinfulness from him, is, that the derangement in human nature,

fall of Adam, is simply "the derangement of the due balance between the spiritual and sensuous natures." Now, while in the passage we have quoted, he says, that we derive from Adam "hereditary sin," he affirms, in another place, that "this non-subjection of the sensuous nature to the spiritual, is not in itself and essentially evil." If it is not so, then, it is not surprising that the author affirms that "this derangement of man's sensuous, in its relation to his spiritual nature, must not be regarded as a punishment inflicted by God on account of the fall" (Vol. II., p. 390). Our author adds,— "Several of our older theologians thus regard it." So they did; but then they regarded the depravity which we derive from Adam as being in itself and essentially sinful; and if so, how could they regard its transmission otherwise than as the infliction of a punishment?

The corruption of human nature derived from Adam, instead of amounting simply to "a tendency in the sensuous nature to suppress the promptings of the spirit, and to rebel against its holy dictates," is more correctly expressed by President Edwards, in his work on Original Sin, where, after observing that God made man at first with two kinds of principles,—an *inferior* kind, consisting of self-love and the natural appetites and passions, which, when alone and left to themselves, are, in the Scriptures, called *Flesh*; and the *superior* principles, in which consisted the image of God called in the Scriptures sometimes *Spirit*, he adds, with great force,—

"These superior principles were given to possess the throne and maintain an absolute dominion in the heart; the other, to be wholly subordinate and subservient. And while things continued thus, all was in excellent order, peace, and beautiful harmony, and in a proper and perfect state. These divine principles thus reigning, were the dignity, life, happiness, and glory, of man's nature. When man sinned and broke God's covenant, and fell under his wrath and curse, these superior principles left his heart,—for indeed God then left him,—that communion with God, on which these principles depended, entirely ceased; the Holy Spirit, that divine inhabitant, forsook the house. . . . And thus man was left in a state of darkness, woful corruption, and ruin; nothing but *flesh* without *spirit*. The inferior principles of self-love and natural appetite, which were given only to serve, being alone, and left to themselves, *of course* became reigning principles; having no superior principles to regulate or control them, they became absolute masters of the heart. The immediate consequence of which was a *fatal catastrophe*, a turning of all things upside down, and the succession of a state of the most odious and dreadful confusion. Man immediately set up *himself*, and the objects of his private affections and appetites, as supreme; and so they took the place of GOD."*

* Part IV., chap. ii. The theological student who makes himself master

Regarding our connection with Adam as insufficient to reconcile the two facts—universal inborn sinfulness, and the personal guiltiness which it involves, Dr Müller, to reconcile these facts, has recourse to the hypothesis of a fall of all the souls of the race of Adam in a pre-existent state. This is the source to which he mainly traces our natural inherent depravity, and in this conception he finds the true explanation of the fact of the personal guiltiness which it involves. He thus writes :—

“ On the one hand, we have inborn sinfulness. . . . On the other hand, we have to acknowledge the guilt of the person in sin, and this implies that each one must, by an act of self-decision, be the author of his own sin. . . . Thus we are driven to the idea of a sinfulness LYING BEYOND OUR INDIVIDUAL EXISTENCE IN TIME, a sinfulness which either directly or in its consequences involves guilt, and therefore must have its origin in self-decision. It affects our conduct, our entire development from the very beginning, and yet it can only have its origin in our own act. . . . The contradiction between sin's universality and its guilt, as arising from an act of will, disappears, if each one who in this life is tainted by sin has, in a life beyond the bounds of time, wilfully turned away from the divine light to the darkness of self-absorbed selfishness.”—(Vol. II., pp. 358, 359.)

The pre-existence of the souls of the human race was a doctrine of many of the ancient philosophers of Greece and Rome. Adopting the theory of atomical physiology, according to which matter is that which has essentially magnitude, figure, and motion, they regarded the soul as a substance quite distinct from the body, or matter, and its modifications; and holding it as a fundamental principle that nothing is made out of nothing, it followed that there is no new substance made which did not really pre-exist, and that both matter and spirit existed from eternity, even as, on the principle that nothing goes to nothing, it follows that both matter and spirit shall continue to exist for ever. At the generation therefore of human beings there is not a generation of souls, for being quite distinct from matter they cannot be generated from it, nor is there the bringing of new souls into existence, for there is no production of anything which was not before, but simply the conjunction of souls previously existing and particular bodies. All the ancient philosophers who, prior to the time of Christ, believed in the soul's immortality after death, equally believed in its pre-existence. In rising to the bright view of the immortality of the soul, they began with the pro-

of President Edwards's works on “The Freedom of the Will,” and on “Original Sin,” will read Dr Müller's work with greater discrimination, and, therefore, with more advantage.

cess of attempting to prove its pre-existence, and from this they argued its permanency after death. "Our soul," says Plato, in his celebrated dialogue of the *Phaedo*, "was somewhere before it came to exist in this present human frame, and from hence it appears to be immortal, and such as will subsist after death." Plato supposed that when God reduced the universe from chaos into order—for he held that matter itself was eternal—he separated from the soul of the world inferior souls, equal in number to the stars, and assigned to each its proper celestial abode; but that these souls, by what means or for what reason he does not explain, were sent down to the earth into human bodies, and this conjunction, from the essential malignity of matter, originated the depravity and misery to which human nature is liable. All the knowledge which men acquire in this life is just the reminiscence of ideas contemplated in that prior state.

Less explicit than these ancient philosophers, Dr Müller leaves us in entire ignorance of the foundation on which he rests his opinion of a pre-existent state, and of the catastrophe of a fall in that state. In his whole discussion on the subject, nothing more appears but this, that he has adopted these ideas because he conceived that they would supply him with the means of untying a difficult knot,—a link for reconciling the two truths, the inborn sinfulness of human nature, and the personal guiltiness of the individual.

This invention of heathen philosophy, though not formerly referred to in any part of the Word of God, is plainly contrary to its whole spirit which leads to the conclusion, that the souls of men begin to exist when they are first united to their bodies. When the Scriptures describe God as "forming the spirit of man within him" (Zech. xii. 10); when they contrast "the Father of spirits" with "fathers of our flesh" (Heb. xii. 9); these expressions not only suggest the idea of immediate creation, but from the connection in which they stand, and from the practical use to which they are applied, convey the impression that the souls of men begin to exist only in the present state. Nor is it unworthy of notice, that while the idea of the post existence of the soul has universally prevailed among all nations and tribes, even among those who have sunk into a state the most savage and ignorant, the idea of its pre-existence has been almost exclusively confined to men of science and speculation.

Then, as to the idea of a fall in this supposed pre-existent state, a difficulty of no common magnitude meets us at the outset. How are we to account for the fact, that the souls of the whole race of Adam, of those who have already existed,

and of those who shall hereafter exist, if, as must be granted, they were created in a sinless state, having no bias to evil but only freedom of choice, individually fell, none of that mighty host remaining "faithful among the faithless?" Might we not have reasonably expected that some among them, like the unfallen angels in heaven, would have resisted the temptations by which they were assailed, and have retained their original integrity? Anticipating this objection, Dr Müller replies, "There is nothing to prevent our supposing that innumerable essences of the same order with ourselves did by their original act resolve not to realise the possibility of evil" (Vol. II., p. 368). There is indeed nothing impossible in such a supposition; but the fact that all the observation and experience of mankind teach that the whole human race (with only one exception, the Saviour) come into the world with fallen natures, sustains the objection, unless it can be proved that there have been instances of an opposite character; for what is patent and certain cannot be set aside by a mere supposition as to what is wholly unknown.

The inspired history of the creation and fall of Adam, is inconsistent with the idea that *his* soul, at least, fell in a pre-existent state, or even that it was pre-existent at all. That history informs us that his soul was created on the sixth day of the creation, immediately by God, who breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and he became a living soul; that Adam was created by God, in his own image, after his likeness; and that his fall took place soon after his creation. These statements, which are very clear and express, are fatal to the hypothesis of a fall in a pre-existent state, in so far as he was concerned. As if to meet this objection, Dr Müller, after affirming that "there is really nothing in the narrative of the fall obliging us to consider that event as the primary beginning of sin, in the strict sense of the word," adds, "that neither the 'image of God,' wherein man was created, nor God's pronouncing everything 'very good,' prevents our believing that the fall was only the outward manifestation of a perversion of the will preceding the empirical life of man,—the outgo of an evil already present *in potentia*, which might, indeed, by persevering effort, have been crushed, but which forms the basis of an original moral depravity in human nature. The endeavour of the Tempter was to bring out to view, and into action, this hidden evil" (Vol. II., p. 385). In plainer terms, this amounts simply to an assertion that the soul of Adam may have fallen in a pre-existent state. And is there really nothing in the sacred narrative which prevents us from believing this? We again fall back upon the obvious meaning of the whole narrative, and affirm that every unsophisticated reader of ordinary understanding, who has not a favourite

hypothesis to support, will unhesitatingly pronounce that its whole spirit and import is utterly at variance with such an idea. The same hypothesis of a pre-existent state, appears to have led Dr Müller to affirm, what we cannot but consider a very extraordinary interpretation, that "the immediate object of the entire narrative of the fall, in Genesis, is to explain the origin of *evil in general*, and not of sin [for sin, according to his doctrine, originated in a pre-existent state]; and hence nothing is told of the moral consequences of the first sin" (Vol. II., p. 386). We maintain, on the contrary, that the immediate object of the inspired narrative of the fall, is to explain the origin of sin. From the minute details given of the fall, it is obviously the design of the Spirit of God to fix our attention especially on sin,—to teach us how malignant, how hateful to God, and how ruinous to the sinner, it is; how the curse of God ever follows it, and never comes except where sin goes before; and that death and all the miseries which have afflicted our world are its fruits and wages. Nor can we admit that the inspired narrative tells us nothing of the moral consequences of the first sin, committed by Adam and Eve. Does not their eyes being opened mean, that they were opened to a discovery of the wretchedness to which they had reduced themselves? Does not their hiding themselves from the presence of the Lord God, among the trees of the garden, imply that their former trust in God as their friend was supplanted by a consciousness of guilt, and the dread of meeting him as their judge? And did not the death threatened include spiritual as well as temporal death, the immediate separation of the soul from God, the loss of man's original conformity to his image, and the corruption of his understanding, will, and affections?

But, again, does not the entire silence of the Scriptures, as to this fall in a pre-existent state, bring the doctrine somewhat into suspicion? Might it not have been expected that this terrible catastrophe, so malign in its influence on the destinies of the human race, if it really happened, would have been announced in a revelation from heaven to man, as a fact which it deeply concerned him to know? The Scriptures tell us of the origin of the scheme of mercy for our salvation in the counsels of peace from eternity, and might it not have been anticipated that they would also inform us of the origin of the sinfulness and guiltiness of our natures which rendered that merciful interposition necessary? And this they have actually done.

But mark, that while they are wholly silent about this fall in a pre-existent state,* they attribute the origin of sin in our

* Yet does not Paul contradict a pre-existent fall, when he affirms, concerning Jacob and Esau, "For the children being not yet born, neither having done any good or evil," &c. ? (Rom. ix. 11.)

world to a totally different cause, tracing it up to Adam, not beyond him,—the argument does not require us to take into account the Tempter,—and fixing it on his fall alone. If, then, the origin of the inborn depravity of our race is to be found solely, or mainly, in the fall of souls in a pre-existent state, how are we to account for it, that the Scriptures say nothing about that fall, whilst, in their opening pages, the fall of Adam, which, disastrous though it has been to the human family, is yet much less disastrous than this extra-temporal fall, supposing it to be true, is minutely detailed? The reason assigned by Dr Müller for this silence is, that “Holy Scripture was not intended to give us speculative knowledge.” “The religious teaching of the Apostles,” he adds, “ever has to do with practical Christian life and consciousness; and it by no means derogates from its high prerogative, to suppose that there is a speculative element of which it takes no cognisance, but in which Christian truth, if thoroughly thought out, finds its only adequate solution” (Vol. II., pp. 360, 393). But this is not a well-founded reason for the silence of the Scriptures on the question in controversy. They never regard the origin of the inherent depravity of the human race as a point of mere “speculative knowledge,” and as having nothing to do “with practical Christian life.”

But it is to be observed, besides, that if Dr Müller’s theory is founded in truth, then the Scriptures,—the whole drift of whose statements on the subject is such as to lead to the belief that the fall of Adam is a full explanation of the entrance of sin into our world,—give us not only an imperfect, but an incorrect account of that mystery, representing the fall of Adam as having vastly more to do with it than it really has. They fail in assigning the proper cause of the innate depravity of our race, and lead us astray by ascribing it to a cause wholly inadequate to produce the effects.

Till this strange and bewildering story of the fall of the untold millions of the souls of the human race, in a pre-existent state, is better authenticated than by the simple *ipse dixit* of one or more learned men, we must exclude it from a place among historical or theological verities, and regard it as wholly valueless to answer the purpose to which Dr Müller would make it tributary. It may be said, that the question is urgent as to the reconciliation of the facts of the inborn depravity of human nature and the personal guilt involved therein. So is the solution of other questions in theology. We can pursue our inquiries only a little way in any direction, when we are met by impenetrable darkness. It will be wise for us to remember, that we have not a key with which to open every lock in the cabinet of the divine counsels. Rather let those

two facts remain an unexplained mystery,—one of those problems upon which a fuller light will be shed in a higher state of existence,—than attempt an explanation on a hypothesis which, though setting up lofty pretensions, is based upon the assumption of being wise above what is written, and can be satisfactory to no one who would have his conclusions to rest on something more solid than a baseless dream.

ART. VII.—*Science and Civilisation.**

“**T**HIS only have I found, that God made man upright, but he hath sought out many inventions.” Such is the adage of the wisest of men, embodied in the best of books. Like all the sentences of that divine volume, it proclaims a truth which all human experience has confirmed, and to which all the researches of human philosophy must ultimately conduct. It is one of those axiomatic statements which, like the discoveries of Galileo and Newton, may raise a tumult of contradiction among the vulgar, and of controversy among the learned, but which, after the storm has spent itself, comes forth again like stars, after the clouds have dispersed, in the calm and silent majesty of truth. Nor does it seem less independent of the support of the friends of revelation, than of the attacks of its adversaries. With all the amount of good sense that has been written in its vindication, there have been mingled many mistakes,—much blundering and nonsense; but, after all that has been done to make it clearer and stronger, “the conclusion of the whole matter” cannot be expressed in terms more concise or more conclusive than in the old formula, “God hath made man upright, but he hath sought out many inventions.” Still the subject admits of discussion, and occasions will occur when it may be necessary to take up the question, both to instruct and to convince the gainsayers. Such an occasion has been given by recent attempts to revive the theory of the Monbodd School, and to prove, with the aid of scientific journals and associations, that man was originally no better than an ape or a savage. To this conclusion the Anthropol-

* The following paper was partly written last year, after the meeting of the British Association at Dundee. Circumstances have prevented its completion until now, when we hope that, though somewhat out of date, it will not be deemed altogether out of season.—EDITOR.

gical Journal has clearly pledged itself, and, under its present management, the public knows what to expect from it. But it is not so easy to see how such a respectable body as the British Association should allow its managers to select, as expositors of modern science, persons who are the avowed and unblushing advocates of that degrading theory. It certainly does seem strange and unaccountable, that the subject of civilisation,—a topic which, we venture to say, now occupies the thoughts of hundreds of our learned men, possessed of genius, eloquence, and skill sufficient to render it attractive, and of knowledge, historic and philosophic, equally sure to do it justice,—should have been assigned to such a person as Sir John Lubbock. The only reason we can imagine for the selection of this gentleman to lecture on this subject is, that he has adopted a theory which, though adverse to the faith of the church, and to the general sense of the community, happens to chime in with the loose, unscriptural notions entertained by some of our would-be philosophers, who possess influence, or affect leadership, in this matter. Such at least was the advantage which this gentleman took of the position assigned to him as lecturer on civilisation. The whole of his lecture was occupied with attempting to answer the arguments of Archbishop Whately, and endeavouring to prove that the original state of man was that of a savage, out of which he has succeeded, in the course of ages, in raising himself, without any extraneous help, to a state of civilisation. We are well aware that this opinion has been advocated by several recent physiologists, and Sir John Lubbock is quite welcome to rank himself amongst them. But we repeat, it is strange that the task of lecturing on such a subject should have been intrusted to one holding an opinion so degrading to our nature, and palpably antagonistic to the word of God. What creed Sir John Lubbock may hold, or if he holds any particular creed whatever, we do not pretend to know; one thing is certain, that his theory is utterly incompatible with all that the Scriptures teach us concerning the origin of man; and that, if we were to adopt the views advanced in this lecture, we must not only renounce all the lessons of human history, but abandon all faith in the divine records, and come to this, as the conclusion of the whole matter, that God hath made man a savage, but they have civilised themselves by seeking out many inventions.

It is far from our intention to enter the lists with Sir J. Lubbock, whose address, as reported in the newspapers, hardly forms a suitable topic for review in our pages. We are sorely tempted, however, to expose the fallacy which pervades the whole of his reasoning against Dr Whately. Sir J. Lubbock

may be a naturalist, but he is evidently no logician; and, in an evil hour, he ventured beyond his proper province to wrestle on the field of argument with the modern prince of logicians. The result, as might be expected, is a deplorable failure. The Archbishop held "That we have no reason to believe that any community ever did or ever can emerge, unassisted by external help, from a state of utter barbarism into anything that can be called civilisation." This sentiment, borne out by the whole tide of man's history, Sir John attempts to meet by maintaining, that fifty cases might be cited to the contrary. The nature of these fifty cases, so glibly appealed to, may be presumed, from the only one he thinks it needful to cite, namely, that of our own country. It would be superfluous to shew that the subjugation of Britain by the Romans, not to speak of the subsequent invasions of the more civilised tribes of Germany and France, which will occur to every school boy, takes this case entirely out of the hands of the advocates of self-civilisation. And, as this is placed at the head of Sir John's fifty cases, we may fairly presume that the other forty-nine, which are discreetly kept in the shade, would be found to be of the same description. Akin to this suicidal proof-case, is the effort made by Sir John to meet the argument which Dr Whately draws from the *stationary* character of barbarous nations placed beyond the reach of outside civilising influences. Unable to deny the fact, attested by such examples as that of the New Zealanders, cited by Dr Whately, who, *to our knowledge*, have remained in the same state of barbarism for two hundred years, he has recourse, first, to the gratuitous assumption, that such nations may require whole ages to reach the point of civilisation; and, next, with an air of far-reaching philosophy, he says, "We have been accustomed to see around us an improvement so rapid, that we forget how short a period a century is in the history of the human race. Even taking the ordinary chronology, it is evident that, if, *in 6000 years, a given race has only progressed from a state of utter savagery to the condition of the Australians*, we could not expect to find much change in one more century." He adds, "I am, however, the less disposed to question the statement made by Archbishop Whately, because *the fact that many races are not practically stationary is, in reality, an argument against that of progress*. Civilised races, say we, are the descendants of races which have risen from a state of barbarism. Barbarians, on the contrary, argue our opponents, are the descendants of civilised races, and have sunk to their present condition. But Archbishop Whately admits that the civilised races are still rising, while the savages are now stationary, and, *oddly enough*,

seems to regard this as an argument in support of the very untenable proposition, that *the difference between the two is due, not to the progress of the one set of races,—a progress which every one admits,—but to the degradation of those whom he himself maintains to be stationary.* The delusion is natural, and like that which every one must have sometimes experienced in looking out of a train in motion, when the woods and fields seem to be flying from us, whereas we know that, in reality, we are moving and they are stationary." We have marked these sentences with italics, in order that our readers may, if they can, discover their meaning. To our mind, we frankly confess, after every allowance for typographical blunders, they present a perfect muddle of confusion, and we can only express our bewilderment in the form of questions. What, then, can Sir John mean by admitting that "the fact that many races are now practically stationary is, in reality, an argument against that of progress?" Is not this the very position which Dr Whately occupies, and from which Sir John Lubbock attempts to dislodge him? Further, Who denies that "civilised races are the descendants of races that have risen from a state of barbarism?" Who ever denied that our own ancestors were at one time painted savages, if not, as Jerome and some others assert, cannibals? Is not the real question at issue, whether they *raised themselves*, in virtue of their own intrinsic powers, and without any help from others? Further still, What can be meant by his asserting that Dr Whately's proposition is, "that the difference between the two is due, not to the progress of the one set of races, but to the degradation of those whom he himself maintains to be stationary?" And, finally, What, in the name of wonder, can he intend by the illustration he draws from the optical illusion of travellers in a train, who, because they themselves are moving, fancy the stationary objects around them to be flying from them? If this metaphor has any application to the point, must we not conclude that the illusion is on the side of Sir John Lubbock and his friends, who, themselves whirled along in the train of civilisation, imagine that the barbarous races are progressing; while Dr Whately, viewing them from terra firma, maintains that they are stationary?

After this unhappy skirmish with the Archbishop, Sir John Lubbock next proceeds to establish his own hypothesis, and here he becomes more intelligible, only, however, to betray more clearly the innate feebleness of his cause. He argues throughout on the supposition that the term stationary, as applied to races in the present question, is synonymous with immoveable; and he imagines that he has made out his point, if he can prove that any particular race of savages has made

the slightest step towards self-improvement in the course of many ages. Thus, with evident exultation, he refers to the invention of the *boomerang* by the Australians,—a very slight step, as he admits, to be taken in 6000 years, but still a step towards self civilisation.* This may serve as a sufficient specimen of the sort of data upon which he founds his theory. He seems to forget that when we speak of a race of savages being stationary, it is not meant that they remain like a mountain "immoveable, infixed, and frozen round," as Milton has it, but that they continue in a state of barbarism; nor is it meant that every such nation continues to stand at the same point. But, in point of fact, dexterity in the use of their simple weapons is one of the marked features of savage life. Equally futile is his argument against deterioration, drawn from the absence of all traces of original civilisation among certain savage tribes. History abounds with too many examples to shew how rapid and complete the process of deterioration becomes, when man is driven by the force of circumstances far from the sources of knowledge, and is left destitute of education and example. It is quite true that where letters, philosophy, and the arts once flourished, we may expect to discover some memorials on the soil abandoned to desolation; but we have no reason to infer that these must follow in the tract of every wandering tribe as it poured over the face of the globe. Even in those countries where they once reached their highest point of perfection, do we not find that amongst the low hordes that now inhabit them, every relic of living civilisation has disappeared? Learning, arts, philosophy, have not been lost, but like the seeds of self-sowing plants, they have taken their flight to other regions, while the roving Arab, and the wretched Bedouin haunt the place of their birth. Thus, while it is true that, in regard to the world at large, civilisation has been making gradual and steady progress, it is equally certain that, in regard to many races and peoples, its benefits have been as entirely lost and gone out of sight as an African river in the sand. By not adverting to this, and other very obvious distinctions, the lecture of Sir John Lubbock is marked by a succession of irrelevant illustrations, loose conjectures, and baseless reasoning. We are compelled to add that his address indicates no feeling of reverence for that divine record which, more clearly and satisfactorily than the researches of human science

* All must admit that some savage tribes are more skilful than others in the invention and use of utensils adapted to savage life. But, unfortunately for Sir John Lubbock's single illustration, it so happens that evidence has been lately found of an instrument exactly resembling the *boomerang* among ancient Egyptian hieroglyphics; indicating that the instrument must have been known in other countries, and that it is not an Australian invention.

have ever yet done, has revealed unto us in its sacred pages, themselves the most ancient of all writings, the true origin and history of our race.* But underneath all this pseudo-scientific jargon, there lies a radical misunderstanding of what civilisation truly is; and to the consideration of this important question, we must devote a few pages.

Viewing civilisation as a question of science, a late writer in a contemporary journal has briefly summed up the opinions of our most celebrated scientific writers:—

“The important question, says Humboldt, has not yet been resolved, whether the savage state, which even in America is found in various gradations, is to be looked upon as the dawning of a society about to rise; or whether it is not rather the fading remains of one sinking among storms, overthrown by overwhelming catastrophes. To me the latter seems to be nearer the truth than the former. Max Müller says, that as far as we can trace back the first life of man, even on the lowest strata of history, we see that the divine gift of a sound and sober intellect belongs to him from the first, and the idea of a humanity emerging slowly from the depths of an animal brutality can never be maintained again. Niebuhr also expressed his conviction, that all savages are the degenerated remnants of civilised races, who had been overpowered by enemies, and driven to seek safety in woods and waste places, till they had forgotten most of the arts of settled life, and gradually sunk into the state in which they are now found. The learned researches of Professor Rawlinson all lead to the same conclusion. We know that within certain limits savages are capable of some improvement,—as might be expected, where reason is added to instinct. But we hold that the theory of man having raised himself by spontaneous and progressive development from a primitive savage state is not supported by proof.”

Thus the verdict of natural science, pronounced by the most competent and impartial jury, is dead against the theory of Sir John Lubbock. But, after all, civilisation, we venture to say, is not, properly speaking, a question which the mere naturalist has anything to do with. We are well

* We do not hold it necessary to do more than refer in proof of the above statement to what Sir John Lubbock said in relation to marriage. Speaking of some ancient traditions he remarks, “*If the idea of marriage had been coeval with our race, if marriage had always appeared as natural, I might say as necessary, as it does to us, such traditions could scarcely have arisen.*” Here we need hardly say is a flat contradiction, not only to the original institution of marriage in Genesis, but to the founder of our religion himself, who appealed to it: “From the beginning it was not so, for God created man male and female; wherefore, let a man leave his father and mother, and cleave to his wife, and they twain shall be one flesh; what, therefore, God hath joined let not man put asunder.” And this contradiction was pronounced with unblushing front in the face of a Christian audience, in the heart of a Protestant and Presbyterian country, without provoking a hiss or eliciting a reply!

aware that many of this class are in the habit of sneering at all other sources of human knowledge. Physiology is the only idol at whose shrine they will deign to pay homage; and that homage is marked by all the bigotry of superstition. To natural science they attribute the supremacy and infallibility which the Roman Church ascribes to the Pope; by its decisions all other truths must be tested, and from its judgments there must be no dissent and no appeal. To this mode of reasoning we have the same answer to give, as we would give to the papist. Science is one thing, and the interpretation of science is another. The utterances of nature, like those of revelation, are of supreme and infallible authority; to the facts of the one, as to the truths of the other, we must bow with implicit submission; but it does not follow that the same attributes belong, or that the same homage is to be paid to the interpretations which scientific men may put upon the one, or which theologians may put upon the other. Still less are we bound to listen with reverence to their dicta when they go beyond their respective spheres; when the theologian would dictate laws to nature, or the naturalist attempt to dabble with theology. In the broad sense of the term *science*, civilisation, no doubt, takes its place among the sciences; but in the modern sense of that term, meaning the knowledge of the material laws, we repeat that it is not a question which depends upon the adjudication of science. The researches of the geologist and the archæologist may indeed tend to the discovery of certain facts bearing on the origin of man; and these it will be time enough to reconcile with the general belief of mankind, when they have been authenticated beyond the reach of rational dispute. But civilisation, viewed as the history of human life on the surface of our globe, is a question not for scientific discovery, but for historical research. Of all things it is the last to admit of theorising. It is a question which must be settled by an induction of facts drawn from observation, and from the literary and monumental history of our race. To classify these facts, to trace them to those laws, physical, moral, and political, according to which they are developed, and thus to ascertain the causes which contribute to the progress or decline of civilisation, is the business of true philosophy. But, indeed, it requires only the exercise of common sense, guided by due reverence for the ordinary sources of human knowledge, and freed from the bias of scientific prejudice and conceit in favour of some preconceived theory, to arrive at just notions on this important topic.

We proceed to observe that considerable confusion has arisen from taking a one-sided view of civilisation. Many who write with great confidence on the subject, view it

entirely on its material or physical side, as implying a state of progress in art, science, and animal enjoyments, but wholly overlooking its moral side, as developed in social order, in the reign of law and justice, and in the practice of social virtues. Man, however, is not a mere animal, guided by blind instincts, and formed only for sensual pleasure. Nor is he a merely intellectual being, guided by the dictates of reason; he is also a moral agent, naturally endowed with a conscience capable of discerning between right and wrong, with a sense of responsibility, and with social affections, on the due exercise of which much of his present happiness depends; and to crown all, man is a religious being, capable of knowing, loving, and serving his Creator, and of living under the sense of an invisible God, and in the prospect of an unseen world. Civilisation, therefore, may be divided into three distinct states or stages—the physical, the moral, and the spiritual. The first of these includes the knowledge of art, science, letters, and philosophy. The second comprehends the advantages of civil government, equitable laws, social order, and the practice of relative duties. The third state, of course, points to that stage of improvement which can only be reached under the supernatural influences of religion. Society may exist in one of those states pre-eminently, while in regard to the others it may be grievously and fatally deficient. One nation may excel, for example, in material civilisation, while it may be grossly corrupt in morals, and in religion; and, on the other hand, another nation may excel in point of morals and pure religion, while it may be far behind in point of material civilisation. But we maintain, that no nation can be said to have reached the full idea of civilisation in which those three states or stages have not been realised.

In regard to what we have termed material civilisation, it would be perfectly idle to dispute its intrinsic value and importance. Without a knowledge of the laws of nature, and of the mechanical arts, which minister to the comfort and embellishment of human life,—without literature, which, according to the poet, “softens the manners, and prevents us from becoming savages,” without philosophy, which contributes so much to elevate and enoble the mind,—society must be in a very crippled and degraded condition, unless in those cases where such advantages are compensated by supernatural subsidies. Here, however, we have to remark, first, that by far too high a value has been set upon these material advantages, as if they constituted the *ne plus ultra* of civilisation, and indeed the only things worthy of the name; whereas in point of fact it can be shewn that these acquirements form only the first step to civilisation, and that, in the absence of true morals

and religion; they have failed to secure, for any length of time, the continuance of national life and prosperity. We remark further, that, in so far as man has advanced in science, arts, and philosophy, he is indebted for that advancement to the Author of his being, as much as he is for the members of his body, and for the materials on which his skill is exerted. It has been rashly assumed by many that man is indebted for all the material advantages of civilisation, simply and solely to himself. It seems to be forgotten that the same God who created the lower animals with their respective instincts, some to soar aloft, others to burrow in the earth, has imparted to man skill to construct implements and machinery, with the faculty of applying them to their respected uses in civilised life. We are told that when God created Adam, "he put him into the garden of Eden to dress it and to keep it." He might have saved him this trouble by a direct intervention of divine skill and power, rendering the garden capable of self-cultivation, but he was pleased to employ for this purpose the gifts of skill, industry, and labour, which he bestowed upon man; thus, the very improvements in husbandry and in manufacture, the wonders of architecture, statuary, and painting, with all the marvellous productions of science, philosophy, and imagination of which men are so much disposed to boast, must be traced back to him who is "wonderful in counsel, and excellent in working." And thus, in the cultivation of the arts and sciences, which go to constitute material civilisation, man is only following out the dictates of the natural law of his being; while, in so far as he succeeds in displaying the social virtues, he is only acting in harmony with the moral-natural law originally impressed upon his soul, a practical compliance with which, in its leading obligations, is essential to the very existence of civil society. He that "hath given the earth to the sons of men," has "made man a little lower than the angels, and put all things under his feet," bestowing upon him faculties and aspirations superior to those of the lower animals over which he rules, and thus fitting him for progress in knowledge, refinement, moral goodness, and social enjoyment; in other words, for that civilisation of which the brute creation is wholly incapable. These remarks, on which we do not dwell, we deem necessary to meet the materialistic and atheistic tendencies of our times, and which, strange to say, are advocated with almost chivalrous devotion by so many of the votaries of natural science. We yield to none in our high reverence and admiration for natural law, and for the world of nature. We are far from thinking that these have been superseded by the supernatural law of religion, or the system of grace. We greatly fear that some good religious men have done no service to their

cause by depreciating the teachings of nature, and attempting to advance religion at their expense. But we feel equally certain that the advocates of materialism, in their vain efforts to thrust out the Almighty from the natural and moral government of the world, have sinned as much against nature as against revelation. There is a vast difference between man's world, disfigured, polluted, and poisoned by sin, and God's world, every creature of which, as coming from his hand, is good, and comely, and pleasant. The former we are bound to hate and to shun; the latter we are bound to love, as God himself hath loved it, and as nature itself teaches us to love it. Christianity takes all this for granted; and so far from extinguishing the law and the love of nature, sanctions and sanctifies both. But the idea of a world without God in it, is as unnatural as the idea of living without God in the world is revolting; it reduces the system of nature into a mystery, darker than any of the dreams of pagan superstition, into an enigma too hard for any sphinx to unriddle, into a headless monster from which imagination shrinks, and which true science repudiates.

In applying these remarks to the actual history of human civilisation, the mind naturally turns to the records of Scripture, itself the most ancient of all histories, and relating to a nation the most ancient of all peoples. While the origin of other nations is involved in impenetrable obscurity, or in vague legendary tales, that of God's favoured nation, the people of Israel, is traced back with a clearness and minuteness seldom to be found even in the history of nations dating their birth a few centuries back. What is more, Scripture carries us back to the primordial state of human society, and, in a few slight touches, reveals to us the general character of the human race, previous to the call of Abraham, the founder of the Israelitish nation. In the book of Genesis we have a brief but instructive account of the two great branches into which the human family became divided after the commission of the first murder, and the flight of Cain from the presence of the Lord. Alienated from the faithful, from participation in their spiritual privileges, from God, and from his ordinances, Cain becomes the patriarch of a separate race, and we find as his first recorded undertaking, the building of a city. The subsequent history of his descendants is so well described by a late writer, that we cannot do better than transfer it to our pages:—

“ Few though the touches in the first record are, they yet shew us those who sprang from Cain, and who were fostered under his institutions, as a skilful and ingenious race. The first rudiments of art, science, and agriculture, appear as due to them, and they first introduced novelties into the methods of life. The genealogy of these

tribes is traced in the narrative down to a point, the epoch of the Cainite Lamech, at which important distinctive features had evidently established themselves. 'With him the ungodliness of the Cainite tribes, which only regarded the things of this world, seems to have reached its climax, as may be gathered from his polygamy, from his godless confidence in, and hymn to, the sword, and from what is recorded of his descendants, who directed their energies exclusively to the cultivation of the worldly side of life.'

"We may suppose these tribes as multiplying rapidly and spreading widely, and as possessors of outer material power; but we have to ask, in pursuing our point, what would be their religious state—their relation to God—their condition as regards man's final destiny? Without true worship, which their chief had given up—without the true human head, Adam—deriving their life, education, and government from Cain—himself full of man's greatest weakness, want of faith, and want of obedience—self-seeking, proud, disappointed, disinherited, and with the tradition of the great crime clinging to his name; with his character in their natures; with his authority and example around them;—what could his children and their children after them become?

"Let it be remembered that now in our times the spread of evil has some very powerful checks which were then wanting. Men are now divided into distinct communities, with rival traditions and interests, separated by nationalities, and secluded by difference of language; thus forming an effectual counterpoise one to another; but no such barrier of separation was in existence at that time, when all are described as speaking the same tongue. Again, bad men are now speedily removed from the scene by death, and have not a long opportunity for corrupting others; but it is related that life was then far more extended in duration: so that generation after generation would spring up, and the older generations would still be present on the stage, with all the power of their position and experience, to work their wickedness upon the young and the weak; and over all would be that dark chief, Cain, still living, a monarch and a parent, revered and feared, in the unchecked sway of human will. And over him, and underneath all human forms, and through the whole texture of their society and personal life, would be Satan working, as chief of rebel-will. Let all this be considered, and it becomes evident that here would be a comparatively accomplished but thoroughly depraved society, full of danger and power of contamination—full of the elements of decay, self-destruction, and self-punishment.

"But now return again to the original society from which Cain went out, and which was continued in the line of Seth. These tribes may have had a simpler life, but they had, according to the theory, the true traditions of worship, the true rule of obedience and of faith. They appear to have been conscious that upon these points there was between them and the Cainites a radical difference; and they may have noted their conviction by the title which they assumed. They called themselves by 'the name of the Lord' (Gen. iv. 26)."

* "Lectures on Early Scripture." By T. F. CROSSE, D.C.L. London: Longmans, Green, & Co. 1867. Pp. 104–107.

From this account of the two primeval races, into which mankind was divided, it appears very obvious that a distinction must be drawn betwixt the civilisation which belonged respectively to each of them. Were we to adopt the one-sided view of the subject held by some of our modern theorists, it would follow that the Cainites were the only race entitled to be regarded as civilised, while the Sethites were little better than a race of savages; that the benefits of civilisation flow as a native consequence from abandoning the worship of the true God, and throwing off the restraints of his law, and that a nation may be regarded as civilised, in the highest and truest sense, though utter strangers to the virtues of justice, purity, and humanity. On the other hand, it would follow, that a people unacquainted with the arts which minister to sensual enjoyment and warlike enterprise, but living in a state of social order and religious purity, cultivating mutual goodwill and affection, and enjoying in great simplicity, indeed, but in sufficient plenty, the bounties of providence, must be regarded as a nation of savages. Such conclusions are manifestly at variance with all the dictates of sober reason and common sense. A distinction must obviously be drawn between what we have called moral and material civilisation. In the former state of society, it is quite possible to conceive that a nation may, independently of art and science, be endowed with those qualities which elevate man above the lower animals, and enjoy all the comforts essential to human happiness. Nay, we can conceive them raised to a degree of refinement in taste, manners, and habits, as far removed from the coarseness of savage life, as it is from the artificial gloss of polished society.

The case of the Jewish nation furnishes another and a striking illustration of the distinction to which we refer. Separated from the surrounding nations, who excelled them in all the arts that embellish life, and in all the material resources which constitute the wealth and strength of worldly kingdoms, they were not only devoid of artistic and scientific skill, but positively prohibited by their divine ruler from availing themselves of such acquirements. All reliance on artificial aids, such as chariots and horses, and other muniments of war, was denounced as indicating want of trust in the promised help of Jehovah. And yet, what nation ever reached a higher degree of moral culture, as well as material prosperity? "Happy art thou, O Israel: who is like unto thee, O people saved by the Lord, the shield of thy help, and who is the sword of thy excellency! and thy enemies shall be found liars unto thee; and thou shalt tread upon their high places," Deut. xxxiii. 29.

Had Israel continued faithful to the law of her God, who could foretell what her future destiny might have been? The language of her prophets would seem to intimate that she might have excelled all surrounding nations in point of national prosperity, peace, and wealth. "The haters of the Lord should have submitted themselves unto him: but their time should have endured for ever." But they knew not the time of their visitation.

Turning our eyes next, for a moment, to the ancient civilisations of Asia, Africa, and Europe, nothing strikes the unprejudiced student of history more forcibly than their rapid decline and fall, after periods of almost unexampled prosperity. The kingdoms of ancient Egypt, Assyria, and Arabia, swarming with population, rich in resources, with their proud capitals, their merchant princes, their renowned schools of learning, their magnificent temples and palaces, their splendid hosts of warriors—where are they now? Their relics are ruins, amidst which the eye of the modern traveller wanders in vain to discover any sign of living civilisation, and the mind becomes almost sceptical as to the records of their ancient glory. How shall we account for this melancholy disappearance of former grandeur, for this sad reverse of national fortune? It is not enough to speak of a law of rotation under which nations, like all earthly things, are supposed to revolve in cycles. The true explanation must be sought in the defective character of the civilisations themselves. Never, in any instance, did they advance beyond the material or moral-natural sphere of improvement. Art, science, learning, philosophy, all were bound to things seen and temporal; they were of the earth earthy; they were made of dust, and to the dust they returned. In asserting this, we do not mean to depreciate the civilisation of heathen countries, in so far as it went. "That the soul be without knowledge is not good"; and in so far as these nations, following the light of nature, elevated themselves in the scale of social life, they had a decided advantage over those who remained in material and mental barbarism. Verily, they had their reward. Nor are we disposed to deny that, in the pursuit of science and letters, in the cultivation of taste, in the refinements of social life, no small amount of earthly happiness must have been realised, even in the absence of all the consolations and hopes of the gospel. But what we maintain is, that the materialism of these heathen countries tended inevitably, in the absence of true moral and religious principle, to degenerate into sensuality and superstition, and thus eventually to issue in that laxity of manners which

saps the foundations of society, and renders even the most powerful monarchies an easy prey to their enemies.

Materialism, whether it appears in the worship of mere physical science, in the grovelling thirst for money, or in the pursuit of animal pleasure, so long as it is confined to individuals, may not affect the interests of the community ; but let it be diffused through the whole mass of society, without the redeeming qualities of virtue and godliness, undiluted by anything like true love to God or man, and it will eat like a canker into the very vitals of a state ; and however fair and flourishing in outward aspect, its very bulk and weight, like that of a gigantic oak, rotten at the core, will only ensure its speedier and surer downfall. Had space permitted, it would be easy to illustrate this principle from the histories of ancient Greece and Rome. The Spartan virtue of early Greece, and the severe purity and integrity of ancient Rome, as we all know, sunk into the slime of unnatural vice and debasing superstition ; and the violation of nature's laws was visited by the fitting retribution of the triumph of a rude barbarism over a degenerate civilisation.

But we must hasten to complete our subject, by adverting, for a moment, to the influence of religion upon civilisation. Some, we are aware, are in the habit of representing Christianity as the main and only civiliser of mankind, and argue that, beginning with this as the prime agent, even in the case of the most barbarous people, the other forms of civilisation will follow in its train. We greatly doubt whether this can be borne out by the experience of the past, or be reconciled with the nature of things. From what has been advanced, it will be seen, that material civilisation must be regarded as the first and lowest stage of human improvement. Christianity is based upon the natural law, physical and moral, which is as truly the law of God as that given by Moses at Sinai, or that which was proclaimed, more clearly and fully, in the sermon on the mount. Viewed as a supernatural revelation, it is a remedial system, moving in a sphere of its own, distinct from and superior to the natural, though in perfect harmony with it. But regarded in its relation to the history and destiny of man, as a denizen of this world, its action is not primordial but consummative, not direct but indirect ; it gives the last and finishing touch to the structure of human civilisation, developing the whole in its true beauty, and imparting to it stability and permanence. Without the aid of religion in some form or another, society cannot stand upright for any length of time ; and it is only in its pure form, as it came fresh from heaven, that it succeeds in accomplishing this subordinate end of its mission. History suggests numerous proofs to shew that man, in his merely natural

state, devoid of true religion, is sure to yield to his innate corruption, to pervert the law of nature, and to slide first into a state of gross superstition, and, finally, into the gulf of a foul and fatal depravity. Christianity alone, by confirming the natural laws of truth, justice, and humanity, and adding its own sacred sanctions and all-powerful motives to support the dictates of reason, conscience, and human policy, can bear up the pillars of the earth, and save the world from universal dissolution.

The foregoing brief remarks suggest several reflections, each of them sufficiently important to form the subject of a separate article. They may serve, for example, to correct certain mistaken notions entertained on the subject of national progress and prosperity. If we may judge from the plans of social reform, now so much in vogue, the main point aimed at is, the promotion of what we have designated physical or material civilisation, to the entire neglect of its moral and spiritual elements. Intellectual culture, mechanical improvement, and æsthetic taste, may be all very well in their own place, but if unaccompanied by the progress of public morals, and unsustained by the elevating and refining influences of pure religion, these physical advantages will never secure the real and lasting welfare of any people. They will not even issue in the advancement of true humanity. Look to that Highland shieling on the mountain slope, with its thatched roof and its smoke-dried rafters. In that wretched hut, far removed from the sights and comforts of what has been loosely termed civilised life, a hardy and virtuous family has been reared in rural simplicity and pristine piety. They may be despised by our modern savans, as far down in the social scale ; and yet, following the dictates of nature, under the guiding influence of religion, this Highland cot may furnish a far finer specimen of the *genus homo*, an infinitely nobler type of humanity, than can be found in the same class among the natives of Italy, surrounded by the choicest monuments of the fine arts, and all the charms and embellishments of artistic society. We have said "in the same class," but in any class of men, who have inherited the vices with none of the virtues of civilisation, who can hesitate to assign the mead of praise to the unscientific Highlander, with his native truth, gallantry, and generosity—aye, and even that

" Honest courtesy,
Which oft is sooner found in lowly sheds,
With smoky rafters, than in tap'stry halls,
In courts of princes, where it first was nam'd,
And yet is most pretended."

Over the relics of ancient civilisation, for the discovery of

which our age is so remarkable, the Ch pause with feelings of a far deeper int animate the man of mere natural science in guesses and theories about their sup be contradicted by further investigatio the illustrations which they afford of in the judgments which it denounces nations; he will see in the downfall : races, once eminent in art and science law which links mankind with the 1 world, and which acts with as unerring material laws of the universe. And hordes still to be found in Africa, Aus will discover the fearful fruits of that 1 according to the Word of God, is inher and which may reduce nations, as certa the human body, to a state of atrophy remedies, and destined to issue in utter

Another inference suggests itself. boast of our high civilisation, while, in vices of savage life prevail among ourse threatens the subversion of society. N teristic of a state of barbarism than th force for the dictates of law, justice, and is war, with all its brilliant appendages, the blood-thirsty savage, with his tomah War may be, and we believe it is, a n will assert that society has reached the when such an evil is found necessary? affect horror at the treachery and ur tribes, while the art of commercial : immorality has come to such perfecti destruction of that mutual confidence society!

In concluding these remarks, we t apparent that the mere physiologist is 1 on a question so wide and comprehensiv He may be cited as a witness, but, : evidence, he must be put out of court, : his own business. There is no grander physical science in combination with meekness and lowliness of mind which faith. But physical science, cultivated sake, and as an end, inevitably tends, contract, to carnalise, and, in some cases we may so speak, the judgment of it becomes insensibly impregnated with t

the soil through which it runs, so that when applied to questions of human life, it becomes confused, giving birth to a monstrous brood of misshapen speculations. In short, the subject is worthy of the gravest attention of all who aim at social reform, which is infinitely more important than any reform of a political description. We have been thoroughly misunderstood, if we are supposed to object to the scientific instruction of the masses ; but if we would expect to see the good results of such illumination, let science go hand in hand with morality and religion, instead of being, as it too often has been, exalted at their expense. Let not our associations, for the encouragement of the arts and sciences, be converted into masked batteries for assaulting the truths of revelation, and the best interests of our moral nature ; and without turning the reading-desk of the lecture-room into a pulpit for the inculcation of spiritual truths, let our public instructors be selected from men who can be scientific without being sceptical, and who can unfold the world of nature in a spirit of reverence for the God that made it.

ART. VIII.—*Irony in History ; or, Was Gibbon an Infidel ?*

By REV. JAMES M. MACDONALD, D.D., Princeton, N.J. Part I.*

1. *THE Charge against Gibbon, as stated by Dean Milman and Bishop Watson.*—The author of the “Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire” has been accused of resorting to irony and sarcasm in those parts of his work where he seems to speak approvingly of Christianity, especially in the fifteenth and sixteenth chapters. The charge, as reduced to distinct terms by those who profess to have made this history their study for the purpose of furnishing a corrective to its statements (or the manner of its statements), is as follows :—

“The art of Gibbon,” says Milman (in his edition of the “Decline and Fall,” designed, professedly, to correct by notes

* We insert the following article from the *Bibliotheca Sacra* for July 1868, without pledging ourselves to the conclusion which the ingenious writer has arrived at. Some may not be prepared to denounce Gibbon as an infidel, and yet may remain seriously persuaded that his mode of accounting for the progress of Christianity in the two famous chapters of his history, is justly chargeable with a tendency too favourable to infidelity. But it must be allowed by all, that the question as to Gibbon’s personal scepticism has been treated in this article with singular fairness and ability.—*Ed. B. F. E. Review.*

such inaccuracies or misstatements as may have been detected, particularly with regard to Christianity), "or, at least, the unfair impression produced by his two memorable chapters, consists in his confounding together in one indistinguishable mass, the origin and apostolic propagation of the new religion with its later progress. The main question, the divine origin of the religion, was dexterously eluded or speciously conceded by Gibbon. His plan enabled him to commence his account, in most parts, below the apostolic times ; and it was only by the strength of the dark colouring with which he brought out the failings and the follies of the succeeding ages, that a shadow of doubt and suspicion was thrown back on the primitive period of Christianity."*

Among the various answers made to Gibbon on the first appearance of his work, Bishop Watson's "Apology" is the only one Milman considers as possessed of sufficient merit to render it worthy of notice. In his preface, above quoted, he describes it as "able," but as being "rather a general argument than an examination of misstatements." "In assigning," says Bishop Watson, "to this astonishing event [the early success of Christianity] five secondary causes, derived from the passions of the human heart and the general circumstances of mankind, you seem to some to have insinuated that Christianity, like other impostures, might have made its way in the world, though its origin had been as human as the means by which you suppose it was spread. It is no wish or intention of mine to fasten the odium of this insinuation upon you."†

Statements of the objections to this history might be given from a great variety of sources, but none from better-informed or more careful writers. The gravamen of the whole appears to be that Gibbon explained the rapid extension of Christianity by secondary causes, and that his express admission of the divine origin of this religion must be taken in an insidious and ironical sense ; his true meaning being that it is unnecessary, in view of such causes, to admit that this religion had any such origin.

2. *Irony, its Nature and Use.*—Irony consists in seeming to adopt false conclusions or sophistical reasonings for the purpose of making their absurdity appear. It is a use of language conveying a meaning contrary to its literal import. It is a *reductio ad ridiculum*. When properly used it is an effective weapon, and there is no kind of writing to which it is not adapted. We find it even in the Bible ; as when Elijah taunted the prophets of Baal, and said, "Cry aloud ; for he is

* "Milman's Gibbon" (Boston, 1853), Preface, pp. 15, 16.

† "First Letter to Gibbon."

a god. Either he is talking, or he is pursuing, or he is on a journey, or peradventure he sleepeth, and must be awaked" (1 Kings xviii. 27). It occurs frequently in the appeals of orators and public speakers ; as, for example, in the Philippics of Demosthenes and the orations of Cicero ; in the speeches of Chatham and Burke, Henry and Webster ; in the sermons of Saurin and South. Sometimes it has been extensively used in arguments on the gravest questions. It characterises in an eminent degree the Provincial Letters of Pascal. The late Archbishop Whately published a pamphlet under the title of "Historic Doubts relative to the Existence of Napoleon Bonaparte," wholly ironical ; the object of which was to shew that objections similar to those brought against the Scripture history, and much more plausible, might be urged against all the received accounts of this distinguished personage of modern history. Edmund Burke had in like manner before him, in his "Defence of Natural Society, by a late Noble Lord," assuming the person of Bolingbroke, proved, according to the principles of that author, that the arguments he brought against ecclesiastical, would equally lie against civil, institutions.

3. *Illegitimate Use of Irony.*—Care, of course, must be taken to make such use of language, or to employ, in oral discourse, such emphasis in pronunciation, that the real meaning may not be mistaken. No argument is required to shew that a writer is guilty of a gross literary blunder who so uses irony that he is fairly understood as sincerely defending the false proposition he assumes, or who so much as leaves it doubtful whether he is employing it or not. If, for example, Elijah might have been fairly understood as expressing his belief that Baal was truly God when he said he was a god ; if Pascal in his raillery of the fathers of the Sorbonne had been understood as pronouncing their logomachies solid arguments ; if Demosthenes had been understood as affirming that the ambassadors and representatives of Philip were superior to the king himself ; Burke as proclaiming himself a disciple of Bolingbroke, and Whately as denying the existence of such a man as Bonaparte, or attempting to inculcate universal scepticism ; or if the language used in any of these cases had left it doubtful what was intended, then is it clear that the writer, however great his name in literature, has made an illegitimate and unskilful use of this mode of writing. Its ironical character must be evident, or the purpose of its introduction is defeated, and worse than defeated.

Especially is this true in history. History professes to deal with facts. We properly regard the narrator of it as in some sense a witness on the stand. He must speak truly. He has no right to trifle, or to speak under such tropes as to hide his

real meaning. If he purposely hides his real meaning, so far as facts are concerned, it of course becomes a false statement ; and to the extent this vice of style characterises a work, it is rendered valueless as a history. Irony may be as legitimately employed in historical as in any other writings ; but under the same necessary law, it must be evident that it is employed. If whole pages and chapters, and an entire class of facts and characters in a history covering several centuries are presented ironically, and the irony is left doubtful, so that we can neither decide where it begins nor where it ends, it seems to be a just ground of condemnation of the whole work. If Gibbon wrote in this style, Paley might well ask with reference to the difficulty of answering him, " Who can refute a sneer ?" and Byron describe him as

" Snapping a solemn creed with solemn sneer,
The lord of irony, that master-spell."

4. *The Historian to speak for himself.*—The most satisfactory course to be pursued in eliciting the truth on this subject, is first to take up the work itself, to ascertain from it, so far as this is possible, the author's real sentiments regarding Christianity, as if we knew nothing of his personal history. To permit what he has himself put on record, in the matter whereof he is called in question, to testify for or against him, according to a just interpretation, seems, indeed, to be the only fair mode of proceeding. After this is done, we may then inquire whether there is any evidence from other writings or sources, that he stood in a hostile attitude towards Christianity,

Not only the true position, on the most important of all questions, of a man who must be allowed to have been one of the greatest ornaments of historical literature is concerned ; but in respect to this important question itself, the divinity of the Christian religion, the truth of history, as far as the authority and testimony of this work extend, is directly involved.

5. *Mr Gibbon on the Success of Christianity.*—The fifteenth chapter opens with this striking paragraph : " A candid and rational inquiry into the progress and establishment of Christianity may be considered as a very essential part of the history of the Roman empire. While that great body was invaded by open violence, or undermined by slow decay, a pure and humble religion gently insinuated itself into the minds of men, grew up in silence and obscurity, derived new vigour from opposition, and finally erected the triumphant banner of the cross on the ruins of the capitol. Nor was the influence of Christianity confined to the period or to the limits of the Roman empire. After a revolution of thirteen or fourteen centuries, that religion is still professed by the nations of Europe, the most dis-

tinguished portion of human kind in arts and learning as well as in arms. By the industry and zeal of the Europeans it has been widely diffused to the most distant shores of Asia and Africa ; and by the means of their colonies has been firmly established from Canada to Chili, in a world unknown to the ancients."

Mr Milman professes to see a change in the tone and a falling off in the style of Mr Gibbon, where he comes to trace the progress of Christianity. It surely is not to be detected in these opening sentences. They form a very remarkable introduction to an assault upon Christianity. The historian even seems to go out of his way to speak of the thirteen or fourteen centuries of revolution which this "pure and humble religion" had survived, of its spread to the most distant shores of Asia and Africa, and its establishment on this continent in a world unknown to the ancients. If this be sarcasm (Milman charges him with "malignant sarcasm") the mode of being sarcastic in Gibbon's day was certainly very peculiar.

6. *The Difficulties Gibbon felt in his Undertaking.*—He proceeds in the introduction to the fifteenth chapter:—"But this inquiry, however useful or entertaining, is attended with two peculiar difficulties. The scanty and suspicious materials of ecclesiastical history seldom enable us to dispel the dark cloud that hangs over the first age of the church. The great law of impartiality, too, often obliges us to reveal the imperfections of the uninspired teachers and believers of the gospel; and, to a careless observer, their faults may seem to cast a shade on the faith which they professed."

The mention of these two difficulties, the suspicious materials of ecclesiastical history, and the necessity of referring to the faults of nominal Christians, prove that he was fully aware of the perilous ground over which his proposed task must take him. But it would be only to the "careless observer" that a shade would seem to be cast over the Christian faith. He immediately adds, in language which sounds very strange as coming from a rejecter of the gospel:—"But the scandal of the pious Christian, and the fallacious triumph of the infidel, should cease as soon as they recollect not only by whom, but likewise to whom, the divine revelation was given. The theologian may indulge the pleasing task of describing religion as she descended from heaven arrayed in her native purity. A more melancholy duty is imposed on the historian. He must discover the inevitable mixture of error and corruption which she contracted in a long residence upon earth among a weak and degenerate race of beings."

Mr Gibbon, in these extracts, either speaks in the most reverential terms of the Christian religion, and avows his faith

in it, or he is speaking sneeringly, sarcastically, ironically. Is there satire or irony in what he says of the removal of the scandal of the Christian, and the fallacious triumph of the infidel, in view of the imperfections of the uninspired teachers and believers of Christianity, by the recollection of its divine origin? Or, in the important distinction he draws between the task of the theologian and that of the historian; the former having to set forth the doctrines of a religion revealed from heaven to inspired, the latter to describe the actions and errors of uninspired, men? On the contrary, never was the humbling doctrine of human degeneracy and infirmity more powerfully or eloquently stated. A divine religion must be judged irrespective of the weakness of its recipients and exponents.

Dean Milman has the candour to acknowledge that the melancholy and humiliating view of the early progress of Christianity cannot be charged wholly on the historian. "It is idle," he says, "it is disingenuous, to deny or to dissemble the early depravations of Christianity, its gradual, but rapid departure from its primitive simplicity and purity, still more from its spirit of universal love." * He admits that the passage just quoted, separated from the following disquisition, "might commence a Christian history, written in the Christian spirit of candour." † In his *History of Latin Christianity*, Milman himself notices how the lofty claims of Christianity, that it came down from heaven, "might appear utterly belied by the claims of conflicting doctrines on the belief, all declared to be essential to salvation, and the animosities and bloody quarrels which desolated Christian cities. Anathema, instead of benediction had almost become the general language of the church. Religious wars, at least rare in the pagan state of society, seemed now a new and perpetual source of misery, a cause and a sign of the weakness and decay, and so of the inevitable dissolution of the Roman empire." ‡ Did Milman, then, regret the substitution of a Christian for the pagan state of society? Or did he intend that the dark colouring in the picture he draws should "throw back" a shadow of doubt and suspicion on the primitive period of Christianity?

7. *Gibbon's Plan in this Portion of his History, and his Reason for Confining himself to Secondary Causes.*—Mr Gibbon next proceeds to announce a very distinct and formal plan, according to which he proposes to discuss the great subject of the progress and establishment of Christianity. And he introduces it with another most striking and distinct concession of its truth and divine origin:—"Our curiosity is naturally prompted to inquire by what means the Christian faith obtained

* Preface to Gibbon, p. 19.

† Milman's Gibbon, Note, p. 505.

‡ Milman's *Latin Christianity* (New York), Vol. i., p. 358.

so remarkable a victory over the established religions of the earth. To this inquiry an obvious but satisfactory answer may be returned—that it was owing to the convincing evidence of the doctrine itself, and to the ruling providence of its great Author.”

Without any qualification, or the least appearance of prevarication, he admits that this answer is both obvious and completely satisfactory ; but to make it in the particular work in which he was engaged, his special or only answer would be to evade the domain of the theologian. Milman accuses him of confounding the origin and apostolic propagation of the new religion with its later progress. Is this just, when he marks, as he does here, so clearly, the distinction between them, and has so good reason, as Milman himself intimates, for confining himself to the human causes that operated in its later progress, to wit, that his account had its commencement “below apostolic times” ? Gibbon would not forget that his work was that of the historian. Hence he proceeds :—“But as truth and reason seldom find so favourable a reception in the world, and as the wisdom of Providence frequently condescends to use the passions of the human heart and the general circumstances of mankind as instruments to execute its purpose, we may still be permitted, though with becoming submission, to ask, not indeed what were the first [again carefully guarding against the impression that he ignored the great First Cause], but what were the secondary causes of the rapid growth of the Christian church.”

The chief ground of the suspicion which had been awakened against Gibbon, as stated by Bishop Watson, was, that he explained the rapid spread of Christianity by these merely secondary causes, as if he intended to insinuate that Christianity, like other impostures, might have made its way in the world though its origin had been as human as the means. But Gibbon claimed, and it is difficult to see why not justly, that to confine his attention to these “secondary causes” was his peculiar province as a historian. That there were such causes, and that such are still in operation, under the direction of Divine Providence, for the promotion of religion, cannot be denied. They are recognised and often specified by the firmest advocates of our holy religion. There is not a history nor a treatise bearing on this subject in which they are not made more or less prominent. Even Milman himself, as a historian, recognises them, and uses language open to similar, or more serious, objection than that used by Gibbon. In his *History of Christianity to the Abolition of Paganism in the Roman Empire*, he thus speaks of the effect of a mistaken opinion or belief, to which Gibbon also incidentally refers in connection

with one of his five causes :—"There can be no doubt both that many of the early Christians almost hourly expected the final dissolution of the world, and that this opinion awed many timid believers into the profession of Christianity, and kept them in trembling subjection to its authority. The ambiguous predictions of Christ himself, in which the destruction of the Jewish polity and the ruin of the city and temple were shadowed forth under images of more remote and universal import ; the language of the apostles, so liable to misinterpretation that they were obliged publicly to correct the erroneous conclusions of their hearers, seemed to countenance an opinion so disparaging to the real glory of Christianity, which was only to attain its object after a slow contest of many centuries, perhaps of ages, with the evil of human nature." * In setting forth the "design" of his history, he expressly says that "it is his opinion that at every period much more is to be attributed [in accounting for 'each phasis of Christianity'] to the circumstances of the age, to the collective operation of certain principles which grew out of the events of the time, than to the intentional or accidental influence of any individual or class of men. . . . It [Christianity] will darken with the darkness and brighten with the light of each succeeding century. In an ungenial time it will recede so far from its genuine and essential nature, as scarcely to retain any sign of its divine original."

These passages are the more important, as Milman appears to have prepared his historical works with the design of counteracting that portion of Gibbon's which relates to Christianity, or as the best mode of answering him. This is inferred from the language he uses in an article on Guizot's edition of Gibbon in the *London Quarterly Review*, for January 1834. That the article is from his pen is evident, as the preface or introduction to Milman's edition is, to a considerable extent, in the same words as those found in this article. He says : "Nothing less is wanting [*i.e.* to weaken or neutralise the general impression of Gibbon's work] than a Christian account of the whole period, written in an attractive style and in a vein of true philosophy, fairly tracing and constantly estimating the real effects of the Christian religion on the mind, the manners, and destinies of mankind. It must be a history attempted on a totally different plan from any yet published in this country, or, indeed, with complete success elsewhere. It must be very unlike the dry polemic manner of Mosheim, and the more animated, but uncritical and sectarian work of Milner. It must obtain its triumph, not by writing down those parts of history on which Gibbon has

* "Milman's History of Christianity (London, 1840), Vol. i., p. 455.

lavished all the power and splendour of his style, but by writing up Christianity to its proper place in the annals of human civilisation. For here is the radical defect in the 'Decline and Fall.' " * It is therefore justly inferred that Milman, both in his "History of Christianity to the Extinction of Paganism," and his "History of Latin Christianity," although Gibbon's name scarcely appears in either, sought to realise in these works what he regarded as the only successful mode of answering Gibbon. But there will be occasion to compare still further the opinions or the manner in which these two historians state important points.

To return: It is true that Mr Gibbon confines himself as a historian exclusively to secondary causes. But, if he admits that the rapid spread of Christian doctrine was owing to the convincing evidence that was in that doctrine itself, and to the ruling providence of its divine author, and at the same time assigns a good reason for confining himself to these causes, to wit, that they alone belonged to his sphere as a historian,—ought he not to have the benefit of his own avowals, until it is clearly proved that they were not intended to be taken in their literal sense? It is to be observed, that he nowhere intimates that these secondary causes are sufficient (but the contrary) to account for the progress of Christianity; and at the same time he unmistakeably asserts that these causes were used or overruled by divine providence to execute the purpose of promoting the reception of this pure and humble religion.

8. *The Secondary Causes Enumerated by Him.*—These are as follows: "1. The inflexible and, if we may use the expression, the intolerant zeal of the Christians; derived, it is true, from the Jewish religion, but purified from the narrow and unsocial spirit which, instead of inviting, had deterred the Gentiles from embracing the law of Moses. 2. The doctrine of a future life, improved by every additional circumstance which could give weight and efficacy to that important doctrine. 3. The miraculous powers ascribed to the primitive church. 4. The pure and austere moral of the Christians. 5. The union and discipline of the Christian republic, which gradually formed an independent and increasing state in the heart of the Roman empire." The examination of these *seriatim* constitutes the subject-matter of the fifteenth chapter.

The author, it will be observed, does not profess to enumerate all the secondary causes, but contents himself with naming those which he thought, it would appear, had been

* "London Quarterly," No. 100, Art. i. Vol. 1. p. 295.

most influential. Not one of them, as stated by him, has the least disparaging aspect towards the Christian cause ; but all are in strict harmony with its lofty and sacred nature. It is mentioned in the Life of Sir James Mackintosh, that he was persuaded "to look through the famous fifteenth and sixteenth chapters of Gibbon." "I could not lay them down," he says, "without finishing them. The causes assigned in the fifteenth chapter, for the diffusion of Christianity, must, no doubt, have contributed to it materially; but I doubt whether he saw them all. Perhaps those which he enumerates are among the most obvious. They might all be safely adopted by a Christian writer, with some change in the language and manner.*

9. *Secondary Causes of the Triumph of Christianity as stated by Merivale.*—The Rev. Charles Merivale, B.D., author of "A History of the Romans under the Empire," Rector of Lawford, and Chaplain to the Speaker of the House of Commons, will not be suspected of hostility to Christianity by any one who has read his History, or the Boyle Lectures for 1864. He is, as his titles indicate, an honoured minister of the Church of England; and yet, in the "Conversion of the Roman empire" to Christianity, he recognises the operation of secondary or human causes. And several of those he names are identical with the ones assigned by Gibbon.

The subject of his Boyle Lectures, was, The Conversion of the Roman Empire. In the Lectures, he confines himself mainly to one branch of the Christian evidences, by which, as he believes, the most refined and intelligent of the heathen were actually converted; namely, to "the sense of spiritual destitution, the consciousness of sin, the acknowledged need of a Sanctifier and a Redeemer." "And with this may be combined," he adds, "the results which flowed from the recognised want of a system of positive belief." But in the Introduction to these Lectures as published, he names other causes as operating in this great transformation, which he had no time to notice with the limits of eight lectures, delivered from a pulpit to a mixed and fluctuating congregation. He says that he refrained from dwelling on that branch of the subject known as the external evidence to the truth of Christianity, not only because it was ill-suited to the pulpit, but because "the age was uncritical, and little competent to weigh such external testimony with the accuracy which is now demanded. There was great proneness to accept the claim of miracles; but at the same time, and in consequence of this very proneness, very little weight was attached to it as an argument of divine power. Great stress was laid on the

* Milman's Gibbon, p. 244, note.

fulfilment of prophecy, but in this respect also the age was liable to be grossly imposed upon ; and it must be allowed that the preaching of Christianity owes some portion, however trifling, of its success to the false pretension of the so-called Sibylline Oracles, which form no part of its genuine credentials." Nothing can be found in Gibbon wearing a more suspicious aspect than this. And yet, no one can call in question the Christianity of the writer, or prove the falsity of what he says.

The third of the four causes which he assigns, is identical with Gibbon's fourth, to wit, the pure lives, or "the practical effect of Christian teaching upon those who embraced it." He thinks this was "a testimony which worked powerfully upon large numbers among the heathen, among persons perhaps of less critical acumen, but eminently susceptible of impressions from the contemplation of goodness."

The fourth and last of the secondary causes named by Merivale is of a similar nature to the fifth and last mentioned by Gibbon. "No argument," he says, "was so effectual, no testimony to the divine authority of the gospel so convincing, as that from the temporal success with which Christianity was eventually crowned." "The conversion," he continues, "of the more intelligent among the heathen, which encouraged the *coup d'état* of the first Christian emperor, had been, I conceive, actually effected before the proved inefficacy of the heathen religions had caused them to be abandoned by the herd of time-servers. The empire as a political machine was now transferred to the rule of Christ," &c. "To the Romans, as long as they retained a spark of ancient sentiment, the emperor, in his capacity of chief pontiff, a title with which Constantine and Valentinian dared not dispense, seemed still the appointed minister of the national religion, still the intercessor for divine favour, the channel of covenanted mercies to the State, whatever form of ministration he might employ, to whatever name he might address himself in behalf of the empire."*

Similar statements and views in Gibbon are precisely those which fall under the censure of Bishop Watson's criticism.

10. *The Manner in which Mr Gibbon unfolds the Operation of his several Causes.*—The first of these is the inflexible and intolerant zeal of the Christians towards false religions, purified from the narrow and unsocial spirit which had distinguished the Jews. He uses the word "intolerant" here, as is evident from what follows, in no odious sense, but as opposed to that "facility with which the most different and

* "Merivale's Conversion of the Roman Empire, see Preface."

even hostile nations embraced, or at least respected, each other's superstitions." There was nothing of this facility in Christianity; being a revelation from heaven, and pronouncing every other religion false, and idolatry to be an insult to Jehovah, it could not recognise in any other religion any claim whatever.

After noticing those features of Judaism which fitted it for a particular country, as well as for a single nation, Mr Gibbon proceeds :—

"Under these circumstances, Christianity offered itself to the world, armed with the strength of the Mosaic law, and delivered from the weight of its fetters. An exclusive zeal [equivalent to his former expression, intolerant zeal] for the truth of religion and the unity of God was as carefully inculcated in the new as in the ancient system; and whatever was now revealed to mankind concerning the nature and designs of the Supreme Being was fitted to increase their reverence for that mysterious doctrine. The divine authority of Moses and the prophets was admitted, and even established as the firmest basis of Christianity. From the beginning of the world an uninterrupted series of predictions had announced and prepared the long-expected coming of the Messiah, who, in compliance with the gross apprehensions of the Jews, had been more frequently represented under the character of a king and conqueror, than under that of a prophet, a martyr, and the Son of God. By his expiatory sacrifice the imperfect sacrifices of the temple were at once consummated and abolished. The ceremonial law, which consisted only of types and figures, was succeeded by a pure and spiritual worship, equally adapted to all climes as well as to every condition of mankind; and to the initiation of blood was substituted a more harmless initiation of water. The promise of divine favour, instead of being partially confined to the posterity of Abraham, was universally proposed to the freemen and the slave, to the Greek and to the barbarian, to the Jew and to the Gentile. Every privilege that could raise the proselyte from earth to heaven, that could exalt his devotions, secure his happiness, or even gratify that secret pride which, under the semblance of devotion, insinuates itself into the human heart, was still reserved for the members of the Christian church; but at the same time all mankind was permitted, and even solicited, to accept the glorious distinction, which was not only proffered as a favour, but imposed as an obligation. It became the most sacred duty of a new convert to diffuse among his friends and relations the inestimable blessing which he had received, and to warn them against a refusal that would be severely punished

as a criminal disobedience to the will of a benevolent but all-powerful Deity."

Is any misrepresentation or innuendo discoverable in this? Does Gibbon's pen here betray its bias against our faith? Could any acknowledged Christian writer present a fairer or more eloquent summary of it, or state more clearly and accurately the relation between the two testaments or economies; or speak more reverentially or conceive more correctly of the true central position of the "expiatory sacrifice" on which Christians rest their everlasting hopes?

Could we place the picture of Paganism which he proceeds to sketch side by side with this, we might perhaps be able more fairly to judge whether his sympathies were with it rather than with the religion of the Bible. He describes it as a system of human fraud and error:—

"The Christian, who, with pious horror, avoided the abomination of the circus or the theatre, found himself encompassed with infernal snares," and on the most "interesting occasions [such as bridals and funerals] was compelled to desert the persons who were the dearest to him rather than contract the guilt inherent to those impious ceremonies." "The arts of music and painting, of eloquence and poetry, flowed from the same impure origin."

Gibbon represents the primitive Christians, whatever differences might exist between them—whether Orthodox, Ebionites; or Gnostics,—as all equally animated with the same abhorrence of idolatry. Of the Ebionite and Gnostic heresies he speaks only as a man could whose sympathies were with the truth. Thus he says:—

"While the orthodox church preserved a just medium between excessive veneration and improper contempt for the law of Moses, the various heretics deviated into equal but opposite extremes of error and extravagance. From the acknowledged truth of the Jewish religion, the Ebionites had concluded that it could never be abolished. From its supposed imperfections, the Gnostics as hastily inferred that it never was instituted by the wisdom of the Deity. There are some objections against the authority of Moses and the prophets, which too readily present themselves to the sceptical mind, though they can only be derived from our ignorance of remote antiquity, and from our incapacity to form an adequate judgment of the Divine economy. These objections were eagerly embraced, and as petulantly urged by the vain science of the Gnostics."

This is inexplicable language for a man to use who was biased either against the doctrines of the Bible as commonly received among Christians or the orthodox view of them.

And here it may be remarked that Mr Gibbon in his history gives proof of the most thorough acquaintance with the patristical polemic theology. He is not excelled in this respect by any professed theologian or any historian of the church. In his discussion of the doctrine of the Logos, for example, and the influence of Platonism in the early church, the Arian and Athanasian controversy, even to the distinction made in the terms Homocousion and Homoiousion, he exhibits a most thorough knowledge of the subjects in all their bearings, theological as well as historical. Nothing is more wonderful than the attainments he had made, and that evidently by original investigations in this department of learning. His work, although Dean Milman in the entire eight volumes of his "*History of Latin Christianity*" makes scarcely an allusion to it, and not one of a disparaging nature, is indispensable to the student of ecclesiastical history.

In the second place, Mr Gibbon considers the doctrine of a future life, supported and sanctioned as it is by Christianity, as among the powerful secondary causes which gave it wide and rapid extension. After referring to the uncertainty of the ancient philosophers with regard to the immortality of the soul, he says, with a discrimination and an appreciation of the whole subject rarely equalled except by those who have followed closely in his steps:—

"Since, therefore, the most sublime efforts of philosophy can extend no further than feebly to point out the desire, the hope, or at most the probability of a future state, there is nothing except a divine revelation that can ascertain the existence and describe the condition of the invisible country which is destined to receive the souls of men after their separation from the body. . . . It was necessary that the doctrine of life and immortality, which had been dictated by nature, approved by reason, and received by superstition, should obtain the sanction of divine truth from the authority and example of Christ. When the promise of eternal happiness was proposed to mankind on condition of adopting the faith and of observing the precepts of the gospel, it is no wonder that so advantageous an offer should have been accepted by great numbers of every religion, of every rank, and of every province in the empire. The ancient Christians were animated by a contempt for their present existence, and by a just confidence of immortality, of which the doubtful and imperfect faith of modern ages cannot give us any adequate notion."

He then proceeds to maintain that the erroneous opinion respecting the Millennium which prevailed in the primitive

church helped the prevalence of Christianity. "The revolution of seventeen centuries," he says, "has instructed us not to press too closely the mysterious language of prophecy and revelation ; but as long as for wise purposes this error was permitted to subsist in the church, it was productive of the most salutary effects." In other words, he held that providence could and did overrule the errors and mistakes of men for the wider diffusion of true religion.

Bishop Watson, on this part of the subject, contents himself with denying that there was anything in "the doctrine of a future life as promulged in the gospel" calculated to induce the heathen to receive the gospel ; and, in regard to the Millennium, his whole argument is directed to prove that the apostles did not expect that Christ would come in their time, which is nowhere asserted by Gibbon. He was writing of what occurred subsequent to the times of the apostles, and distinctly states what is well known to have been the fact, that this expectation arose from pressing too closely, or from a too literal interpretation of the language of prophecy.

In treating the third of the causes named, "the miraculous powers ascribed to the primitive church," it is not to be forgotten that he means, by the primitive church, the church in the post-apostolic period. Gibbon did not believe that the gift of miracles was continued in the church after the times of the apostles. In this he followed the Rev. Conyers Middleton, D.D., author of the *Life of Cicero*, and a distinguished minister of the Church of England. He maintains, nevertheless, that the false claim to miraculous powers had its effect in gaining adherents to the Christian cause. Whether he was right or wrong in this opinion, his holding and advocating it does not of itself prove that he intended thereby to cast a slur on the Christian faith.

"The duty of an historian," he says, "does not call upon him to interpose his private judgment in this nice and important controversy [in respect to the genuineness of the post-apostolic miracles, a controversy which, just previously, in connection with the publication of Dr Middleton's views, had waxed warm and angry] ; but he ought not to dissemble the difficulty of adopting such a theory as may reconcile the interest of religion with that of reason, of making a proper application of that theory, and of defining with precision the limits of that happy period, exempt from error and from deceit, to which we ought to be disposed to extend the gift of supernatural powers. From the first of the fathers to the last of the popes, a succession of bishops, of saints, of martyrs, and of miracles, is continued without interruption ; and the progress of the superstition was so gradual and

almost imperceptible, that we know not in what particular link we should break the chain of tradition. . . . And yet, since every friend to revelation is persuaded of the reality, and every reasonable man is convinced of the cessation of miraculous powers, it is evident that there must have been some period when they were withdrawn from the Christian church. . . . The recent experience of genuine miracles should have instructed the Christian world in the ways of providence, and habituated their eye (if we may use a very inadequate expression) to the style of the divine artist. Should the most skilful painter of modern Italy presume to decorate his feeble imitations with the name of Raphael or of Correggio, the insolent fraud would soon be discovered, and indignantly rejected." Surely a Christian writer might say, as Mr Gibbon does, that the Most High could carry on his cause in spite of the impositions of those who laid claim to miraculous powers, and could even overrule these impositions for its advancement. Mr Gibbon, adhering to his stately historical style, in distinction from the theological, says, "The unresisting softness of temper, so conspicuous in the second and third centuries [Mr Merivale, in a passage already quoted, says, "the age was uncritical, and little competent to weigh external testimony"] rendered the miracles of the primitive church of some accidental value to the cause of truth and religion." "The real or imaginary prodigies, of which the primitive Christians so frequently conceived themselves to be the objects, the instruments, or the spectators, very happily disposed them to adopt with the same ease, but with far greater justice, the authentic wonders of the evangelic history; and thus, miracles that exceeded not the measure of their own experience, inspired them with the most lively assurance of mysteries which were acknowledged to surpass the limits of their understanding."

In all this, and in all that he says on this topic, there is not the least sign discoverable of sympathy with his contemporary Hume, in the principle, that no amount of testimony is sufficient to prove a miracle, as being contrary to human experience. In the contrast which he runs between the true and the false, he does not merely concede, but claims, that there must have been true miracles. Bishop Watson, in what is termed his "Reply," contents himself with attempting to rebut the prejudices against all miracles, of many in his age, in which class, he says, expressly addressing himself to Mr Gibbon, "I am far from including you."

The pure morals of the Christians is the fourth of the human causes on which Mr Gibbon comments as seconding

the influence of revelation. He extols their virtues, but does not leave out of the picture the shades imparted by their censures and proscription of many of the innocent pleasures and amusements of life. Alluding to the "reproach suggested by the ignorance or the malice of infidelity," that many of the converts to Christianity were once atrocious criminals, he says: "But this reproach, when it is cleared from misrepresentation, contributes as much to the honour, as it did to the increase of the church. The friends of Christianity," he continues, "may acknowledge without a blush, that many of the most eminent saints had been, before their baptism, the most abandoned sinners."

At the same time, he represents the early fathers, in accordance with what cannot be denied, as carrying the "duties of self-mortification, of purity, and of patience, to a height which it is scarcely possible to attain, and much less to preserve, in our present state of weakness and corruption." Mr Milman pronounces it an insidious and sarcastic description, and regards the paragraphs in which it is contained, as the most uncandid in his History.

The union and discipline of the Christian republic, or church, is the last of the series of causes on which Mr Gibbon remarks. He says of the first organised churches in the Roman empire, that "independence and equality formed the basis of their internal constitution. . . . The public functions of religion were solely entrusted to the established ministers of the church, the bishops and the presbyters; two appellations which, in their first origin, appear to have distinguished the same office and the same order of persons." He then points out the circumstances under which the "title of Bishop began to raise itself above the humble appellation of Presbyter."

Bishop Watson admits that the account he gives "of the origin and progress of episcopal jurisdiction, of the pre-eminence of the metropolitan churches," is, "in general, accurate and true"; and is not surprised at the severity with which he speaks of the most benign religion that can be conceived of, being made, through the ambition and avarice of men, the instrument of oppression.

Mr Gibbon next proceeds to take a general and combined view of the influence of his five causes; and referring to the loss of power over the common mind of the prevailing superstitious systems, uses this language, very remarkable for an unbeliever:—

"Some deities, of a more recent and fashionable cast, might soon have occupied the deserted temples of Jupiter and Apollo, if, in the decisive moment, the wisdom of Pro-

vidence had not interposed a genuine revelation, fitted to inspire the most rational esteem and conviction, while, at the same time, it was adorned with all that could attract the curiosity, the wonder, and the veneration of the people." In concluding the chapter, after having spoken of the comparatively small number who enlisted themselves under the banner of the cross (not more than a twentieth of the subjects of the whole empire), before the conversion of Constantine, he says : " But how shall we excuse the supine inattention of the Pagan and philosophic world to those evidences which were represented by the hand of Omnipotence, not to their reason but to their senses ? During the age of Christ, of his apostles, and of their first disciples, the doctrine which they preached was confirmed by innumerable prodigies. The lame walked, the blind saw, the sick were healed, the dead were raised, demons were expelled, and the laws of nature were frequently suspended for the benefit of the church. But the sages of Greece and Rome turned aside from the awful spectacle, and, pursuing the ordinary occupations of life and study, appeared unconscious of any alterations in the moral and physical government of the world. Under the reign of Tiberias, the whole earth, or at least a celebrated province of the Roman empire, was involved in a preternatural darkness of three hours. Even this miraculous event, which ought to have excited the wonder, the curiosity, and the devotion of mankind, passed without notice in an age of science and history."

Is this a sneer or satire ? Of course it must be so regarded if the author of the " Decline and Fall " was a deist. Then there is nothing more atrocious and unpardonable in all literature. It falls little short of impiety and blasphemy to hold up to ridicule and contempt the narrative of the crucifixion of the world's Redeemer. And where does this vice of the historian begin, and where does it end, in a work which has so much to do with the history of the church, its ministers and doctrines ? And of what avail, then, are the eulogiums passed upon his laborious research, his general accuracy, his unrivalled felicity of expression, and the wonderful combination of all the great qualifications of a writer of history found in him ? They cannot and ought not to save him or his work from the contempt of his fellow-men ; for the charge brought against him is established only by proving another ; to wit, an unpardonable perversion and an utter disregard of the dignity of a noble species of literature to which he devoted his life, by devoting so many of his pages (his readers finding it difficult to decide when and where) to satire and irony on the most serious of all subjects.

Comparing the effect of what good Bishop Watson says of "the silence of profane historians concerning the preternatural darkness" with the impression the language of Gibbon is fitted to produce on an unsuspecting mind, it seems far less favourable to the wonder and devotion which such a miracle ought to awaken. He devotes himself to proving that the darkness may have been neither excessive nor extensive, and might have been occasioned by the darkening of the sun through the intervention of clouds, and that it extended only for a few miles about Jerusalem.

In like manner, Milman explains away much of the supernatural which accompanied the crucifixion. "This supernatural gloom," is his language, "appears to resemble that terrific darkness which precedes an earthquake.* . . . The same convulsion [the earthquake] would displace the stones which covered the ancient tombs, and lay open many of the innumerable rock-hewn sepulchres which perforated the hills on every side of the city, and expose the dead to public view. To the awe-struck and depressed minds of the followers of Jesus, no doubt, were confined those visionary appearances of the spirits of their deceased brethren which are obscurely intimated in the rapid narratives of the evangelists." To which he adds, in a foot-note: "Those who assert a supernatural eclipse of the sun, rest on the most dubious and suspicious tradition; while those who look with jealousy on natural causes, however so timed as, in fact, to be no less extraordinary than events altogether contrary to the course of nature, forget or despise the difficulty of accounting for the apparently slight sensation produced on the minds of the Jews, and the total silence of all other history."† All this in a work written, as it would seem, for the express purpose of answering or meeting "the radical defect in the 'Decline and Fall'"!

Even Guizot seems to regard the darkness at the crucifixion as a phenomenon which did not extend beyond Jerusalem, and as no more than an obscurity of the atmosphere occasioned by clouds, or some other natural cause; and refers for authority to the Notes of Michaelis and the Commentary of Paulus on the New Testament.‡

Better let the Pagan world be represented, as it is in the pages of Gibbon, turning aside from the awful spectacle, and busying itself in the ordinary occupations of life, unconscious

* "History of Christianity from the Birth of Christ to the Abolition of Paganism," &c. (London, 1840), Vol. I., p. 363.

† Idem, p. 365.

‡ See his note near the end of the fifteenth chapter of the "Decline and Fall."

of what is passing—another mournful proof of the blinding influence of the “ungedliness and unrighteousness of men, who hold the truth in unrighteousness” (Rom. i. 18 sq.).

As illustrating the manner in which Gibbon regarded the supernatural, it would be apposite in this connection, were there space, to introduce his account of what he styles a “preternatural event, not disputed by the infidels,” and supported by such “authority as should satisfy a believing, and must astonish an incredulous mind,” namely, the earthquake and fiery eruption which defeated the apostate Julian’s attempt to disprove the prophecies of Christ, by erecting a stately temple for the Jews on the commanding eminence of Moriah. “The imperial sophist,” he says, “would have converted the success of his undertaking into a specious argument against the faith of prophecy and the truth of revelation.” He speaks of the evidence supporting a divine interposition to defeat this impious undertaking in a way which implies that it could not be called in question by a fair and reasonable mind, and, of course, convinced his own.

11. *The Causes, the Extent, Duration, &c., of the Persecutions to which the first Christians were exposed.*—As the author commences his account of the persecutions with those under Nero, and omits all mention of those recorded in the Acts of the Apostles, it has been contended that this omission tends to throw discredit on the authenticity of that book of holy Scripture; for, if authentic, it was necessary for him to consult and quote it. Two reasons may be given for his neglect to refer to the persecutions recorded in the Acts, without any intention on his part, to express doubt, or cast the least suspicion on its authenticity. 1. His subject confined him to the persecutions inflicted by the Pagans; those recorded in the Acts were Jewish persecutions; and it does not give an account even of the martyrdom of the apostle Paul. 2. He avowedly left the defence of Christianity, as a divine revelation, or where it rested on inspiration for its evidence, to the theologian.

Again: it has been objected to this chapter, that it is “a disgraceful extenuation of the cruelties perpetrated by the Roman magistrates against the Christians”; and that it exhibits a “most contemptibly factious spirit of prejudice against the sufferers.” For proof of these charges, the manner in which he relates the death of Cyprian is referred to; and he is said to dwell, “with visible art, on the small circumstances of decorum and politeness which attended his murder.” Turning to that account (it is written in Gibbon’s best style), nothing is found disparaging to Cyprian; but the Proconsul is represented as pronouncing, with some reluct-

ance, the sentence of death ; and his presbyters and deacons are described as permitted to accompany him to the place of execution, and to assist him in laying aside his upper garment ; and the Christians are represented as permitted to transport his remains by night, in a triumphant funeral procession, with a splendid illumination, to their burial-place. His account of the martyrdom of Cyprian professes to be a mere abstract of the authentic history of that event contained in an original life of Cyprian by the deacon Pontius, the companion of his exile and the spectator of his death, whose candour and impartiality he praises. He presents this account as “ conveying the clearest information of the spirit, and of the forms of the Roman persecutions.” It appears, therefore, that if there is any appearance of extenuation of the Roman persecutions in this case, it is chargeable to the deacon Pontius, which account he epitomised.

Again, it has been thought that Gibbon betrays his scepticism by his disposition to underrate the number of martyrs. On this point he agreed with the learned Dodwell, who expressed the opinion which has been confirmed by the latest investigations in ecclesiastical history. Dr Philip Schaff, citing the high authority of the learned and impartial Niebuhr, says, “ that the Dioclesian persecution was a mere shadow as compared with the persecution of the Protestants, in the Netherlands, by the Duke of Alva, in the service of Spanish bigotry and despotism.” And Dr Arnold, in speaking of a visit to the church of St Stephen at Rome, remarks : “ It is likely enough, too, that Gibbon has truly accused the general statement of exaggeration. But divide the sum total of reported martyrs by twenty, by fifty if you please ; after all, you have a number of persons, of all ages and sexes, suffering cruel torments and death for conscience sake and for Christ’s sake, and by their sufferings, manifestly with God’s blessing, ensuring the triumph of Christ’s gospel.” Mosheim says that, no doubt, many of the names of those found in the immense army of the martyrs might, with great propriety, be struck out of the list ; and adds a remark, in which he is almost literally followed by Gibbon, that the Roman magistrates did not direct their severity promiscuously against the great body of Christians at large, but selected as objects of capital punishment such of them as filled the office of bishop and presbyter. “ Were Dodwell’s position,” he adds, “ to be so far modified as to assert merely that the number of martyrs was considerably less than is commonly supposed, it must command the ready assent of every one whose judgment has not been misled by popular traditions and idle stories.”

If Gibbon "regretted the subversion of the old Pagan systems," which is one of the charges brought against him, we should naturally expect to discover the evidence of it in his account of the emperor Julian. On the contrary, he distinctly says, that in the creed which Julian adopted "by a strange contradiction, he disdained the salutary yoke of the gospel, while he made a voluntary offering of his reason on the altars of Jupiter and Apollo. . . . But as the faith which is not founded on revelation must remain destitute of any firm assurance, the disciple of Plato imprudently relapsed into the habits of vulgar superstition." He charges him with puerility and fanaticism, with duplicity, hypocrisy, and persecution.* Contrast with this account the sketch which he draws of "the great Athanasius," as he styles him, on whose history and character he seems to dwell, as with a loving fondness, for nearly one hundred pages of his work. "The immortal name of Athanasius will never be separated from the catholic doctrine of the Trinity, to whose defence he consecrated every moment and every faculty of his being. . . . Seated on the archiepiscopal throne of Egypt, he filled that eminent station above forty-six years, and his long administration was spent in a perpetual combat against the powers of Arianism." He "displayed a superiority of character and abilities which would have qualified him, far better than the degenerate sons of Constantine, for the government of a great monarchy." To no other character that comes into notice in his history does Mr Gibbon pay a higher tribute than to the strict and rigid Athanasius.

PART II.

12. *Gibbon's Autobiography and Miscellaneous Writings.*—It remains to inquire whether, from other writings, or his opinions elsewhere put on record, there is any evidence that Mr Gibbon rejected Christianity. His *Miscellaneous Works*, published after his death, by his friend Lord Sheffield, are contained in two large quarto volumes, of more than fourteen hundred pages. In this large mass of writings, consisting of *Memoirs of his Life and Writings*, several entire works or fragments on a great variety of literary themes, copious notes on his life-long readings and studies, and a large number of

* "Even bigots," says Rev. Dr Robertson, the historian, "I should think, must allow that you have delineated his most singular character with a more masterly hand than ever touched it before." In the same letter (dated May 11. 1781), he expresses the hope that his new volumes will escape the illiberal abuse his first volume drew upon him; and he pays him this high compliment: "It was always my idea that an historian should feel himself a witness giving evidence upon oath. I am glad to perceive, by your minute scrupulosity, that your notions are the same."

letters to and from both friends and strangers—is there anything to convict him of hatred to Christianity ?

His autobiography is one of the most remarkable records of a literary life ever penned. The late Rev. J. W. Alexander says, in his *Familiar Letters* : “ Read Gibbon’s autobiography again ; it rouses me like a bugle.” Scarcely with any other celebrated author of another generation and country, have we the means of becoming so well acquainted. “ Few men, I believe,” says Lord Sheffield, in his Preface, “ have so fully unveiled their own characters by a minute narrative of their sentiments and pursuits, as Mr Gibbon will be found to have done ; not with study and labour, not with an affected frankness, but with a genuine confession of his little foibles and peculiarities, and a good-humoured and natural display of his own conduct and opinions.”

13. *His Childhood ; Mrs Porten ; Oxford ; becomes a Roman Catholic.*—Of a feeble constitution, he was doated upon, and his childhood cared for, by an affectionate aunt (Mrs Porten), who inspired him with an invincible love of reading ; “ at whose name (he says, late in life) I feel a tear of gratitude trickle down my cheek.” In his sixteenth year, his health improved, and he was sent to the University of Oxford, where he seems to have been left very much to himself, to study or to neglect study, as best pleased him. He complains particularly that an ecclesiastical school should have failed to “ inculcate the orthodox principles of religion,” and that he “ was left, by the dim light of his (my) catechism, to grope his (my) way to the chapel and the communion-table, where he (I) was admitted without question, how far, or by what means, he (I) might be qualified to receive the sacrament.” Neglected by his instructors, he gave way to the taste which had been fostered in him, and read incessantly. His passion then was for Arabic learning, which never deserted him, and which he was able to turn to good account in his subsequent historical investigations.

His active mind also busied itself with religious questions. The controversy, occasioned by Dr Middleton’s *Treatise on the Genuineness of Post-apostolic Miracles* was then rife. He read what was written on both sides ; and, perhaps, naturally enough, considering the ground which the Church of England then so strenuously held, in favour of the genuineness of these miracles, became a Roman Catholic. He read Bossuet’s exposition of the doctrine of his church, and *History of the Variations of Protestantism*, and the writings of Parsons, a Jesuit of the time of Queen Elizabeth, and was strengthened in his conviction. He went to London, and, at the feet of a Romish priest, abjured the Protestant faith,

and wrote a long letter to his father, announcing the change with all the ardour of a new convert.

14. *Is sent to Lusanne ; Mr Pavilliard ; returns to Protestantism, and receives the Sacrament.*—His connection with Oxford was, of course, brought to an end, and, with his father's displeasure, he was sent to Lusanne, to make his home in the family of a minister of the school and church of Calvin, a Mr Pavilliard. This clergyman's house was in a gloomy unfrequented street of this unhandsome Swiss town. In his native country the expatriated youth had been accustomed to all the elegancies and luxuries of life. He was now without a servant, and could neither speak nor understand a word of French. He devoted himself earnestly to study. Mr Pavilliard was an excellent scholar, and directed his studies with judgment and zeal. French at length became more familiar to him than his native English, and was used as the instrument in conducting his mental processes. He attacked Latin, and eventually Greek, with an ardour seldom equalled, and became an exact and critical scholar in these languages. From all that he read and studied he filled common-place books with a profusion of notes and references.

Under the instruction and guidance of his clerical tutor, he was soon led to renounce the Roman Catholic faith, and joined the communion of the Swiss church. Mr Pavilliard wrote to his father and aunt, " God has at length blessed my cares, and heard our prayers. I have had the satisfaction of bringing back Mr Gibbon to the bosom of our Reformed church. I have made use with him neither of rigour nor of artifice. On Christmas-day, 1754, he received the sacrament in the Protestant church of Lusanne. " It was here," says the historian, in his *Memoirs of himself*, " that I suspended religious inquiries ; acquiescing with implicit belief in the tenets and mysteries which are adopted by the general consent of Catholics and Protestants." These *Memoirs* profess to have been written, in the fifty-second year of his age, after the completion of his history. We have, therefore, a formal, distinct avowal of what his faith was, and had been from an early age up to the period named. He surely ought to have the benefit of his own statement, and solemn declaration on this subject, if we are to respect him at all, or believe him on any other. Or, is it necessary to regard him as here speaking in a double, ironical sense ?

The following is from a letter which young Gibbon wrote to his father on the occasion of his return to the Protestant faith. It illustrates, at the same time, that it shews what was the state of his religious opinions, to what an extent he had

lost the correct use of his mother-tongue, and had adopted a foreign idiom. A comparison of it with the stately and magnificent sentences, which subsequently flowed from the same pen in the "*Decline and Fall*," affords a signal proof of how little can be made out of the probabilities of internal evidence against clear external testimony: "I am now a good Protestant, and am extremely glad of it. I have in all my letters taken notice of the different movements of my mind, entirely Catholic when I came to Lusanne, wavering a long time between the two systems; and at last fixed for the Protestant. I had still another difficulty: brought up with all the ideas of the Church of England, I could scarcely resolve to commune with Presbyterians, as all the people of this country are. I at last got over it, for considering that whatever difference there may be between their churches and ours in the government and discipline, they still regard us as brethren, and profess the same faith as us. Determined, then, in this design, I declared it to the ministers of the town, who, having examined me, permitted me to receive it with them, which I did Christmas-day," &c.

15. *The Books he valued, and his Study of the Scriptures in Greek.*—He always speaks of Mr Pavilliard in terms of the highest respect and gratitude. He names a book which next to his tutor, contributed most effectually to his education, "*De Crousaz's Logic*;" whose philosophy, he says, was formed in the school of Locke, and his divinity in that of Limborch and Le Clerc, ministers of the church of Holland. He also gives the names of three books which he says contributed to form the historian of the Roman empire: the *Provincial Letters* of Pascal, *Gianone's Civil History* of Naples, and the *life of Julian* by the Abbé de la Bleterie, the perusal of which seems to have led to his first essay on "the truth of the miracle which stopped the rebuilding of the temple of Jerusalem."

He appears to have been a regular attendant on public worship, both in Switzerland and England, and makes record in his journal of reading every Sunday the Scripture lessons of the day in the Greek, a very remarkable practice in one who had no respect for revelation. He commenced it as early as 1759, and continued it even when marching about the country, as he did for more than two years, as a captain of the national militia in the Hampshire regiment, whenever he attended church. In his journal, under date of July 18. 1762, he records: "I did nothing but go to church. The lessons were the twelfth chapter of 2d Samuel and the fifth chapter of St John's Gospel, both of which I read in Greek."

His regiment was then in camp at "the fashionable resort

of Southampton." Again, under date of August 1st, same year: "I read the lessons at church in Greek, namely, the thirteenth chapter of the first book of Kings, and the twenty-first chapter of St John's Gospel. How very free a version the Septuagint is; for I imagine ours is a very literal one." "October 31. 1752: I went to church, heard a pretty good sermon from Mr L., and read the second lesson, the fourth chapter of St Luke, in Greek."

If it should be imagined that he adopted this practice solely for the purpose of perfecting or preserving his knowledge of Greek, it should not be overlooked that he continued it when he had become absorbed in the study of Homer and Longinus.

16. *His first published Essay and Devotion to Literature.*—In his nineteenth year he returned to his native land, and three years afterwards published his first work, an Essay on the "Study of Literature," written in French, which gained him some reputation. "The design of this essay was to prove that all the faculties of the mind may be exercised and displayed by the study of ancient literature, in opposition to D'Alembert and others of the French Encyclopædists, who contended for that new philosophy that soon produced such miserable consequences;"* from which it is evident that he could not at this period of his life have been a disciple of this "new philosophy." His next effort was an attack on Warburton's famous "Divine Legation of Moses." Warburton was then the dictator and tyrant of the world of letters; and although Gibbon exposed the weakness of the particular theory he assaulted, the critics scarcely deigned to notice his performance. He projected other works which were successively abandoned. He travelled in France and Italy, and while at Rome, October 15. 1764, the subject of his great work was suggested to him. He was a long time engaged in preparation, and making tentative efforts. He made many experiments before he could satisfy himself with his style. "Three times did I compose the first chapter, and twice the second and third, before I was tolerably satisfied with their effect. In the remainder of the way, I advanced with a more equal and easy pace; but the fifteenth and sixteenth chapters have been reduced, by three successive revisals, from a large volume to their present size." These chapters formed the conclusion of the first volume. The subject of them evidently deeply interested his mind, and they were composed with the greatest study and care, so that when he says in them that to the inquiry by what means

* "Chalmers's Biographical Dictionary," Article, Gibbon.

the Christian faith obtained so remarkable a victory, the "obvious but satisfactory answer may be returned, that it was owing to the convincing evidence of the doctrine itself, and to the ruling providence of its great Author," we are bound to believe that it was no careless expression, and that throughout these chapters he weighed every word.

17. *Eminent Religious Contemporaries who do not appear to have detected Hostility to Christianity in Gibbon.*—The Rev. Dr George Campbell, translator of the Gospels, author of the *Philosophy of Rhetoric*, who answered Hume so triumphantly on miracles, and the Rev. Dr Robertson the historian, praised the work on its first appearance, as a masterly performance, both in respect to matter and manner. Dr Campbell's letter to Mr Strahan, on the appearance of the first volume of the *Decline and Fall*, is too important to be omitted. It is dated Aberdeen, June 25. 1776: "My expectations," he says, "were indeed high when I began it; but I assure you the entertainment I received greatly exceeded them. What made me fall to it with greater avidity was, that it had in part a pretty close connection with a subject I had occasion to treat sometimes in my theological lectures; to wit, the Rise and Progress of the Hierarchy, and you will believe that I was not the less pleased to discover in an historian of so much learning and penetration, so great a coincidence with my own sentiments, in relation to some obscure points in the Christian Antiquities." This theological professor and astute defender of the Christian faith, in the foregoing expression of high satisfaction, obviously refers particularly to the fifteenth chapter. And can it be supposed that he would have volunteered such an expression had he detected anything in the tone and manner of Mr Gibbon wearing the aspect of hostility to Christianity?

Dr Robertson was a friend and frequent correspondent of Mr Gibbon. After reading his "Vindication," he writes to him that he had not observed any expression in it which he should wish to be altered. He belonged, it is said, to the moderate party, so-called, in the Church of Scotland; but as regards the doctrines of his church, expressed in its "Standards," was a man of unquestioned orthodoxy. He was Principal of the University of Edinburgh, and minister of one of the parish churches. Robertson and Campbell are the greatest names the Scottish church numbers among its clergy, with the exception perhaps of Reid and Chalmers.

18. *Mr Gibbon's Rejoinders to the Attacks on him in his Memoirs and "Vindication."*—"I had flattered myself, he says in his *Memoirs*, "that an age of light and liberty

would receive, without scandal, an inquiry into the human causes of the progress and establishment of Christianity." But there is one expression in his *Memoirs*, touching these suspected chapters, which, taken by itself, wears, it must be admitted, a somewhat suspicious aspect. It is found in the following: "Had I believed that the majority of English readers were so fondly attached even to the name and shadow of Christianity; had I foreseen that the pious, the timid, and the prudent would feel, or affect to feel, with such exquisite sensibility, I might perhaps have softened the two invidious chapters." But what, clearly, must be his meaning in this? He must, of course, refer to their attachment to that which was no more than a "name and shadow," and no real part of Christianity. He could not, with any sincerity, doubt that the majority of English readers were attached to the name itself of Christianity, however far many of them may have been from being real Christians. Nothing, he emphatically declares, was more remote from his intentions and expectations, than to disturb the feelings of the pious. He seems to have been wholly taken by surprise; he frankly owns that he "was startled." Having, in these same *Memoirs*, declared his "implicit belief" in the doctrines of the Bible, as commonly received among Christians, we must understand him, where he speaks of "the name and shadow of Christianity" in such a manner that he shall not stultify and confound himself. He evidently means no more than that he was wholly taken by surprise, that his discussion of the human or secondary causes of the progress of Christianity, his rejection of some things which the Christian world, Protestant as well as Roman Catholic, had united in receiving, such as the post-apostolic miracles, and the immense number of the primitive martyrs, should have given such offence.

His fear, he says, was soon "converted into indignation," and he resolved to observe silence, trusting himself and his writings to the candour of the public, until Mr Davis of Baliol College, Oxford, presumed to attack, "not the faith," but the fidelity of the historian." This led to the publication of his "*Vindication*," mainly confined to the charge of want of historical fidelity, brought by Davis, and Chelsum, and Travis. Dr Johnson is reported to have said that if Davis had made the errors Gibbon charged back upon him, he must have been a blockhead. And an equally unsparing criticism was passed by the learned Porson on the attack of Archdeacon Travis. It may well be asked, If Gibbon was so formidable an antagonist to the Christian cause, why its defence was left to men so feeble, that their connection with

this controversy is all that preserves their names from utter oblivion? Why did not Hurd, or Horne, or Porteus, or Horseley, enter the lists against him? Gibbon speaks with great respect of Bishop Watson, and of his mode of thinking, as bearing a "liberal and philosophic cast." "He very justly," says Gibbon, "and politely declares that a considerable part, near seventy pages of his small volume, are not directed to me, but to a set of men whom he places in an odious and contemptible light." The part referred to is headed, "Appeal to Infidels." "He fairly owns," continues Gibbon, "that I have expressly allowed the full and irresistible weight of the first great cause of the success of Christianity; and he is too candid to deny that the five secondary causes which I had attempted to explain, operated with some degree of active energy toward the accomplishment of that great event. The only question which remains between us, relates to the degree of the weight and effect of those secondary causes; and as I am persuaded that our philosophy is not of the dogmatic kind, we should soon acknowledge that this precise degree cannot be ascertained by reasoning, nor perhaps be expressed by words." Dr Watson, in a letter to Gibbon, which from its date, January 14. 1779, appears to have been called forth by the "Vindication," addresses him as "a man whom I wish no longer to look upon as an antagonist, but as a friend."

To Dr Priestley, who charged him with attempting "to discredit Christianity in fact, while in words he represented himself as a friend to it," he writes: "As long as you attack opinions which I have never maintained, or maintain principles which I have never denied, you may safely exult in my silence and your own victory." And then he retorts on him in these caustic words: "The public will decide to whom the invidious name of unbeliever justly belongs; to the historian, who, without interposing his own sentiments, has delivered a simple narrative of authentic facts, or to the disputant, who proudly rejects all natural proofs of the immortality of the soul, overthrows (by circumscribing) the inspiration of the evangelists and apostles, and condemns the religion of every Christian nation, as a fable less innocent, but not less absurd than Mahomet's journey to the third heaven."

19. *Gibbon's Opinions of Bayle, Voltaire, and the French Revolution.*—He evidently held Bayle in high esteem as a philosopher, but seems to have regarded Voltaire as no more than a fine and superficial writer; and of his *Treatise on Toleration*, had no higher opinion than Bishop Watson himself. In his journal, under date of March 14. 1764, he speaks of having read this treatise, and pronounces it a

trifling collection of commonplace remarks, and represents himself as "diverted with his false and contradictory conclusions concerning ancient history. This history he (Voltaire) says is filled with prodigies. They cannot be true ; therefore ancient history consists merely of fable and conjecture," &c. Voltaire meant to include the Bible, on account of its miracles or prodigies, with other ancient history.

Mr Gibbon seems to have had no sympathy whatever with the infidels of the French Revolution. The execution of the monarch filled him with grief and indignation. The prevalence of revolutionary doctrines on the Continent at length led him to desert his beloved Lusanne. "I beg leave," he said, "to subscribe to Mr Burke's creed on the Revolution of France." In reference to his decided opinions on this subject and his strong feelings, Lord Sheffield says: "So strongly was his opinion fixed as to the danger of hasty innovations, that he became a warm and zealous advocate for every sort of old establishment, which he marked in various ways, sometimes rather ludicrously ; and I recollect, in a circle where French affairs were the topic, and some Portuguese present, he, seemingly with seriousness, argued in favour of the inquisition at Lisbon ; and said he would not at the present moment give up even that old establishment." This, doubtless, serves to explain the sense of a sentence in one of his letters to Lord Sheffield, in which he descants with great warmth on what he styles the "French disease" ; a sentence which, taken by itself, certainly wears a suspicious aspect. After speaking in terms of high admiration of Burke's book, he says : "The primitive church, which I have treated with some freedom, was itself at that time an innovation, and I was attached to the old pagan establishment." The mode of expression is certainly not to be approved ; but if he could mark his dislike of the new doctrines, which were threatening society with disaster, by arguing with seeming seriousness in favour of the inquisition, it is easy to see how, in the warmth of his zeal, he was led into like exaggeration in reference to the old paganism. His meaning was, that he would resist any change in established institutions, rather than accept the doctrines and innovations of these French reformers.

20. *Result of this Inquiry.*—The result then of this inquiry, respecting the unbelief which has been charged upon Mr Gibbon, is, that we nowhere find, in his voluminous writings, any instance of clear, outspoken unbelief, or rejection of the Christian religion. It appears that he had difficulties on the subject of the authenticity of the Book of Daniel, which he laid in a letter, which has never been published,

before Dr Richard Hurd, who had just then published a work on prophecy. But the fact that these difficulties were confined to a single book of the Old Testament, and that he submitted them to so able a scholar and defender of the of the faith as Dr Hurd, is surely no evidence that he rejected divine revelation. On the contrary, we find him expressing implicit belief in the doctrines commonly received among Christians. It further appears that the charge of infidelity on the part of some of his contemporaries, arose from what they were pleased to regard as inuendo; in other words, they charged that he said one thing while he meant another. If they were right, then he prostituted history; he set at naught the dignity of a science to which he devoted years of studious investigation, and his conduct richly deserves the severe language of Priestley: "A conduct which I scruple not to call highly unworthy and mean; an insult to the common sense of the Christian world"; and justified him in calling upon Gibbon "to defend not his (your) principles only, but his (your) honour. For what can reflect greater dishonour on a man than to say one thing and mean another?" It greatly lessens, if it does not destroy, the value of his work as one of history, and ought to consign it to no higher place than that of a splendid specimen in the cabinet of literary curiosities.

21. *Can the Opinion concerning Gibbon's Unbelief be accounted for?*—If he was not an infidel, it seems indeed truly marvellous that the opposite opinion has been so generally adopted in the religious world. Many writers of the highest repute seem to have regarded it as beyond all question. Were it not for the danger of extending these pages beyond their proscribed limits, it would be instructive to notice the manner in which they state and attempt to refute the alleged position of the historian, as it could hardly fail to lead to the conviction that they would have been wiser to imitate those eminent defenders of Christian truth, Campbell, Horseley, and Horne, who sounded no note of alarm.

But may not this unfavourable opinion be accounted for in good measure at least from the following considerations?

1. He was led to advance views on several religious questions of great interest at the time he wrote, which had led to heated controversy, contrary to those which had been long and almost universally received; which the Reformed churches had adopted from Romish historians. His vast learning placed him far in advance of the generality of scholars of the Protestant world. Ecclesiastical history had not been studied and explored as it has since been.

One of these subjects was the genuineness of the miracles subsequent to the apostolic age. The general opinion of the religious world may be learned from the *odium theologicum* which was visited upon Dr Conyers Middleton, on the publication of his work, "A Free Inquiry into the Miraculous Powers," &c. Dr Middleton was a man of extensive learning. The doctrine of his book was, that miraculous powers ceased with the apostles, and that following their age we can find an interval of about fifty years where there is no mention made of the existence of, or claims to, any such powers, during which some of the purest and best Fathers wrote. Dr Middleton's book, the doctrine of which is now received with general approbation throughout the Protestant world, threw the whole English church into a ferment, as it seemed to involve such men as Chrysostom, Augustine, and other venerated writers of the church, previous to the Reformation in delusion. It was charged against him that his object was to impeach the credit of the miracles of our Lord and his apostles. His work was condemned by the authorities of his church, and the University of Oxford conferred degrees on his opponents. Gibbon, an under-graduate of the University, read Middleton's book, and the numerous answers it called forth ; and was led by the controversy and the Roman Catholic authors he consulted, to renounce the Protestant faith. From the severe manner in which Mosheim, who defended the genuineness of the miracles of the second and third centuries, condemned Middleton, we learn that the opinions of the continental divines corresponded to those of the English.

Gibbon, upon his return to Protestantism, became a disciple of Middleton on this question, and in his history advanced the same views. "The church of England, which had prided herself on her liberality and learning, found that she was ranked in point of credulity with Papists and Pagans themselves. It was very exasperating. She rose against it and attacked the historian ; and hence Gibbon has received a character for misrepresentation which he does not deserve."* His rejection of the miracles subsequent to the times of the apostles was interpreted as a virtual rejection of all miracles, and of course caused him to be regarded as an infidel ; and all that he might say touching Christianity to be looked upon with doubt and suspicion. Consistently with this, what Gibbon says of the miracles and doctrine of the gospel, and the ruling providence, in the affairs of men, of its Author, is understood in an ironical sense, or as a compliment couched in latent sarcasm.

* Dr L. Withington, *Theol. Rev.* (1835), Vol. ii. p. 45.

Another of the subjects on which the opinions of Gibbon awakened prejudice and suspicion against him, was the number of martyrs, and what he says respecting the intemperate zeal with which many sought the crown of martyrdom. In this he followed the learned Dodwell. Gibbon and Dodwell may have underrated their number, but not more, according to Mosheim, than they were overrated by their opponents. Ecclesiastical writers on this subject too, have now come very generally to agree with them. It would not be surprising, when we take into account the peculiar facts of his early personal history, if Gibbon took some pleasure in penning such sentences as the following :

“The church of Rome defended by violence the empire which she had acquired by fraud ; a system of peace and benevolence [meaning the true Christian system, or the gospel] was soon disgraced by proscriptions, war, massacres, and the institution of the holy office [the inquisition]. And as the Reformers were animated by the love of civil as well as of religious freedom, the Catholic princes connected their own interest with that of the clergy, and enforced by fire and sword the terrors of spiritual censures. . . . If we are obliged to submit our belief to the authority of Grotius, it must be allowed that the number of Protestants who were executed in a single province and a single reign far exceeded that of the primitive martyrs, and in the space of three centuries, and of the Roman empire.”

2. The bitter spirit of animosity against Christianity, which prevailed in Europe at the time Gibbon wrote, which found expression in the French Encyclopedists, and the writings of such men as Bolingbroke and Hume, made it easy to arouse suspicion, and prepared the Christian world to believe that there were no arts, however mean and dishonourable, to which the enemies of the gospel would scruple to resort. It is more easy to arouse than to allay suspicion. And in a controversy in which the accusation of infidelity lies against one side, there can be no doubt on which side Christians will readily arrange themselves. It is evident that the majority have never examined the question in regard to Gibbon for themselves, but have been content to take their opinion at second-hand. Something very different from what appears even to have been good Bishop Watson's final judgment in the case has been propagated as an opinion no longer to be questioned ; so much so, that no more is necessary than to ask, Was Gibbon an infidel ? to awaken surprise equal, perhaps, to that which would be occasioned were it seriously asked, Was Baxter a Christian ?

Taking up one of the latest publications in which Gibbon is noticed, we find almost as many errors or misstatements concerning him, as there are sentences. (1.) "Gibbon was even more of a Frenchman than Hume." The meaning must be that he was more infected with French philosophy, and pleased with French manners and society. Gibbon appears to have visited Paris only twice; and, on both occasions, tarried but a short time. M. Necker and his excellent lady, the daughter of a Protestant clergymen, were his chief friends. (2.) "Sundering his relation to Oxford in his seventeenth year, he embarked upon a course of living and thinking which, whatever advantage it might afford to his purse, was not likely to aid his faith." His connection with Oxford was dissolved on account of his renunciation of the Protestant faith; and he was sent to Switzerland, under the displeasure of his father, on the most stinted pecuniary allowance. (3.) "By a sudden caprice he became a Roman Catholic, and afterwards as unceremoniously denied his adopted creed." The good Mr Pavilliard, on the contrary, relates with what patience and pains he gradually led him back to the truth. (4.) "In due time he found himself in Paris publishing a book in the French language." This book, the *Essay on the Study of Literature*, written in French, was published in London, when he was yet an entire stranger in the French capital. (5.) "He there fell in with the fashionable infidelity, and so far yielded to the flattery of Helvetius, and all the frequenters of Holbach's house, that he jested at Christianity and assailed its divine character." When Mr Gibbon was on his first visit at Paris, he was a visitor at the house of the Baron d'Olbach, and received polite attention from Helvetius; but there is not the least evidence, in his *Memoirs*, or letters, that Christianity was jested at, or even made the subject of discussion. (6.) "While residing at Lusanne, Switzerland, he cultivated the florid French style of composition, and applied it in his *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*." He so far lost the correct use of his native tongue during his early residence at Lusanne, that it was only by a long and difficult process he was able to form the style adopted in his history after his return to England. (7.) "That work has been severely censured; but, despite its defects, it is one of the permanent masterpieces of English literature." The first true sentence. (8.) "In the fifteenth and sixteenth chapters the author gives his opinion of Christianity." These chapters contain the history of the progress and early persecutions of Christianity, and it is not their object to express the author's opinion of Christianity, excepting as it appears in the statement of the causes of its

wonderful victory. (9.) "He attributes the progress of the Christian religion to the zeal of the Jews, to the doctrine of the immortality of the soul as stated by philosophers, to the miraculous powers claimed by the primitive church, to the virtues of the first Christians, and to the activity of the Christians in the government of the church." It will be observed by comparison with Mr Gibbon's language on a previous page, that the writer states but two of these causes, with any degree of correctness. In reference to the second, for example, the doctrine of immortality, Mr Gibbon argues as philosophy could only feebly point out the desire, the hope, or at the most the probability, of a future state, that "a divine revelation" was necessary.

The volume from which the above citations are made was published in New York in 1865, has passed through several editions, and been republished in London. If its statements of the history of opinion in other cases is no more accurate, of what value can it be ?

Take another example of like kind. Thomas B. Shaw, B.A., Professor of English Literature in the Imperial Alexander Lyceum of St Petersburg, in his excellent work, "Outlines of English Literature," proves, in his notice of Gibbon, in more than one instance, that he had formed his judgment, rather from the opinions of others, than from an original examination of his writings. Thus he represents Gibbon as returning to England, shortly before the close of his life, induced by the death of Lord Sheffield, to console and counsel the widow. Of course he could never have read Gibbon's *Memoirs of himself*, nor his posthumous *Miscellaneous Writings*, published under the editorial supervision of this same Lord Sheffield. In the several American editions of Professor Shaw's work, which have been examined, this error is repeated. And it will probably be found that in the majority of cases, the unfavourable judgment respecting Gibbon has been taken at second hand, or even at third and fourth ; and in this manner has been perpetuated, in literary history.

It may be asked, If Gibbon was not an infidel, why he did not, in so many words, deny the charge, and in full vindication of himself, employ his fine powers in defence of Christianity ? So far as denying the charge is concerned, it might be said that he did this in his letters to Dr Watson, the only one of his assailants for whom he seems to have had any respect ; but especially in the notice took of the bishop's Apology in his *Vindication*, where he distinctly says that the only question between them related, not to the first cause, nor to the existence of secondary causes, but merely

to the degree of influence to be attributed to those secondary causes in the propagation of Christianity.

After he had recovered from the first startling effect of the objections made to his history, he confesses to a feeling of "indignation"; but he resolved, as he informs us, where his principles were concerned, to leave them to speak for themselves. To defend himself against the charge of infidelity, in the form made, would have been to acknowledge himself guilty of a most disreputable literary blunder, in having composed a work which required to be vindicated against such a charge. We have had an example, recently, of the indignant scorn with which a distinguished American writer of history repelled the charge, that he "despised American democracy," as "so pitiful a fabrication, that he blushed (I blush) while he denounced (I denounce) it." He refers to his writings for proof of his being a "fervent believer in American democracy," and says, "I scorn to dwell longer on the contemptible charge."* So Mr Gibbon appears to have preferred that his contemporaries and posterity should judge him in respect to the matter whereof he was called in question by what he had put on record, rather than by any reply he could make to the false accusations or misrepresentations, and special pleadings of his antagonists.

22. *Conclusion—Morals of Gibbon.*—The severest critics and reviewers of Mr Gibbon have never attempted to cast any reproach on his character as an amiable and upright man, nor to question the stainless purity of his morals. They admit that he was "affectionate and even piously attentive to relatives who could contribute little to his entertainment, and nothing to his emolument; that he was constant in unequal friendship, and grateful to fallen greatness; that he delighted in the conversation of chaste and accomplished women, and his correspondence with friends of his own sex was never tinged with pruriency of imagination."† It is not contended that he was a devout Christian; he may have been what some would denominate "a man of the world." He was devoted to literature and philosophy, and was ambitious of fame. But that he rejected Christianity remains to be proved. He sometimes gave utterance to expressions, which, taken by themselves, or viewed apart from other expressions, might be interpreted to wear a hostile aspect towards revealed religion. For example, when he speaks of Mr Joseph Milner, one of

* The Motley-Seward Correspondence, Nov. 21. 1866 and Dec. 11. 1867.

† See "Quarterly Review," Vol. XVII., p. 387.

his critics, as pronouncing "an anathema against all rational religion," and denouncing "natural Christians," we might be ready to say Mr Gibbon was a rationalist, which is but another name for infidel. But as we read on we discover his meaning: "The natural Christians, such as Mr Locke, who believe and interpret the Scriptures, are, in his [Mr Milner's] judgment, no better than profane infidels." The writings of Mr Locke had had great influence in his education, and he seems here clearly to wish to be classed with those Christians who, according to the religious and philosophical writings of Mr Locke, "believe and interpret the Scriptures."

Can a man who after fifty years of age writes memoirs of himself, in which he puts on record that from an early period of his life, he had acquiesced in the tenets of the Christian faith, and in whose voluminous writings cannot be found any counter-statement, nor anything clearly irreconcilable with this avowed belief, be regarded as an infidel, on the ground merely of an interpretation, which involves the supposition of an utter disregard by him of the laws of good writing?

Shall we needlessly, or by a process of laborious argument, find an enemy in one who holds so eminent a place in the world of letters?

ART. IX.—*Unpublished Letters of Melancthon.*

EVERYTHING that dropped from the pen of the illustrious Melancthon, must be interesting to all the admirers of that most amiable, and at the same time accomplished and magnanimous reformer. Many of his letters have been preserved, and may be found in the *Corpus Reformatorum*. Recently, however, a collection of them, amounting to thirty-seven, was discovered by Dr Augustus Scheler, of Brussels, Librarian to the King of the Belgians, and published him, with explanatory notes, in a German periodical entitled *Serapeum*. We propose, in the present article, to give a selection from these letters, now translated for the first time into English from the Latin and German originals. Dr Scheler, in transmitting to us the numbers of the *Serapeum* which contains them, has kindly furnished us with a Preamble, giving

an account of his discovery of the collection, and authenticating the letters as those of the reformer. This Preamble we now prefix; and we do not consider it necessary to say more at present, in addition to what Dr Scheler has done, by way of comment on the letters themselves. We simply introduce them to the notice of our readers. Those omitted are, for the most part, brief and formal notes. None of the letters are of much intrinsic importance; but some of them are curiously illustrative of the pacific temper and loving heart of the reformer; while others (we might refer particularly to No. 13) throw light on his firmness and fidelity to principle.

Preamble by Dr Scheler.

Two years ago, I happened to be in the Royal Library of Brussels, when my friend, M. Ruelens, one of the wardens, shewed me, lying on the floor of a litter room, a precious acquisition which the Government had just authorised him to make for the Library. It consisted of a number of manuscripts which had belonged to the deceased Canon De Rom, Rector of the Roman Catholic University of Louvain, and Member of the Royal Academy of Belgium.

In hastily rummaging among these papers, I remarked a number of bundles filled with letters of Melancthon's, which my friend informed me were copies made at the end of last century by a theological professor of Louvain, Van de Velde (born in 1743, died in 1823), a man well known for his learning and his ultramontane zeal, and not less for his passion for books, and the precious library he acquired for himself. Observing the interest with which I regarded the fact of a collection of letters by Melancthon and other notable personages of the Reformation times having been made by a Roman Catholic doctor of the University of Louvain, M. Ruelens, offered me leave to take the whole of this part of De Rom's manuscripts with me, in order to examine it more minutely, and also to classify it.

It did not require me much time to perceive that I had before me the result of a literary exploration extending over many years, which had been undertaken in view of collecting all that could be found remaining in the German libraries in the way of unpublished letters by the great reformer. Professor Van de Velde had employed, with extraordinary zeal and patience, in this labour, the leisure time which had been forced upon him by his contests with the French civil authorities during the latter years of last century, and the early part of the present, on the subject of the privileges of the University

of Louvain. As his papers were in perfect order, well labelled, well numbered, and furnished with indications as to the date and the place where they were written, it was not difficult to follow, as it were, step by step, the learned traveller in his scientific journey, and to point out the libraries which he had successively visited, and the manuscripts which he had inspected in them.

The result of this examination has been communicated to the Bibliographical Journal of Leipzig, entitled the *Serapeum*, where it appeared at the beginning of last year. But my task went beyond a simple enumeration or analysis of the copies made by the Rev. Canon Van de Velde; I was anxious to find out whether, after the immense labour which the editors of the *Corpus Reformatorum*, have imposed upon themselves, since his time, after the abundant harvest they have gathered in matter pertaining to Melancthon, there might not yet remain, in the field cultivated by Van de Velde, some interesting gleanings to be made.

At the moment in which I undertook the work of collating the papers of the Belgian Professor, with the ten volumes of Bretschneider, I saw, by the prolegomena of the *Corpus* (tome I., p. 87), that the great Saxon theologian was aware of the effort that had been made by Van de Velde to collect the unpublished letters of Melancthon, but his attempt to discover and make use of the materials thus gathered had proved fruitless. Finding himself thus under the necessity of doing without them, Bretschneider consoled himself in the supposition, that it was not very probable, "*Se multa nova in hac sylloge habiturum fuisse.*" This circumstance stimulated my ardour, and, after some trouble, I had the satisfaction of being able to offer to the public thirty-seven letters which had escaped the editor of the *Corpus* and his fellow-labourers.

Whatever interest they may have, either for history in general, or for the biography of the great man who wrote them, or for theology, or general edification, I am persuaded that these papers, containing the remnant of a literary activity which is still held in veneration by serious-minded men of all parties, will be made welcome by the learned public. As they are still but little known, in spite of their publication in a German journal devoted to such specialities, I willingly avail myself of the kind offer made me by the editor of this *Review*, and I here present them anew, grouped according to their chronological order.

Dr AUG. SCHELER.

BRUXELLES, 15th August 1868

SPECIMENS OF THE LETTERS.

1. *To the Most Illustrious George Agricola, distinguished for learning and virtue, and Regent of the Schools of Learning in the famous city of Amberg, his dearly beloved brother.*

[This letter begins with eight Latin distichs which, under the title "*Cerning the Woman of Canaan. Mat. xv.*," are contained in Vol. x., page 623 of the *Corpus Reformatorum*; however, in our letter the last distich is entirely different, namely,

Gnate dei generis nostri massam induis, ut nos
Vivifica infirmos haec tua massa gerat.

Thou Son of God who hast clothed Thyself with our nature, in order that
This Thy life-giving constitution might support us in our weakness.]

I write these prayers to shew the grief which I feel on account of the public calamities. Dissensions rend the churches; and, while I write, I hear that the war of which you told me is begun in Bavaria. To Schallungus and all the rest I send my salutations. Regarding "The Human Will," I have also replied in the Bavarian articles. Farewell, dearly beloved.—27th Febr. PHILIP MELANTHON.

[Archiv. of Regensburg. On the margin Agricola has written:—"I received this in the year 1559, on the 10th day of March. He writes in poetry regarding the deplorable state of the Church, the civil commotions in Bavaria, and a refutation of the Bavarian articles."]

2. *To the Most Illustrious Prince and Ruler, Lord John Albert, Duke of Mecklenburg, Prince of the Ancient House of Heneta Schwerin, Lord of Rostock, Stargard, &c., his own Most Clement Master.*

I know that Your Highness, with praiseworthy constancy, has always been liberal in encouraging literature and in aiding learned men, nevertheless I ought to be, and I am, grateful to Your Highness, because Your Highness has written also that Tillemannus, so worthy of praise both as a man and an artist, has been honoured with greater favour, on account of my letters. Now, although I am aware that such recommendations should be modest, yet Your Highness will understand why I should write regarding Adam Siberus, who sends Your Highness books of poems, when Your Highness has read some of them. I have no doubt that the sweetness of his style, his elegance, and his choice of subjects, will afford pleasure to Your Highness. I think the author is known to the celebrated Mylius. In this place our Siberus was long a successful teacher. He adorned his profession by a correct deportment. His selection deserves all praise, because he knows that such genius is the gift of God; and he chiefly celebrates God, and good princes as God's gifts. Moreover, Your Highness knows the ancient adage—

Τιμὴ δὲ τὰ πράγματα ἡρειστοῦρα ποιεῖ.

"Rank makes things look noble."

The studies of such writers are incited and sustained both by the approving testimonies and the munificence of wise princes. Wherefore, to Your Highness, I respectfully commend this Adam.

I am not sure whether Your Highness may have seen a representation of the ancient shekel. Therefore I send a shekel of the just weight, namely, *four drachms*, and having the inscription and symbols in which that wise age delighted. The rod of Aaron signifies doctrine, and the cup of incense denotes true prayer. Both symbols therefore signified that among this one people there was the priesthood of the true God, true doctrine, and true prayer; and that these things being of the highest importance were to be upheld and defended by rulers, and held in reverence by all. As Your Highness acts in this manner, I hope also that this coin will be the more acceptable, and will throw light on many passages of history.

I send Your Highness some pages, from which you will observe that a new attack has been made upon us concerning the invocation of the Mediator. The contest is carried on with great keenness. The cynic of Prague, whose name is Canusius, holds that the son of God is not to be invoked as mediator; and yet Cyprian says, "I beseech Thee, O Son of God, to make intercession on my behalf with the Father." With reference to this controversy, I purpose invoking the aid of the Son of God himself, to publish a refutation of the ravings of the cynic. In fine, I pray the Son of God, our Lord Jesus Christ, crucified for us and raised up again from the dead, that he would preserve and direct Your Highness. On the 18th day of June 1556. Your Highness's very much obliged

PHILIP MELANTHON.

N.B.—Shekel is the name of a weight and of a coin. The weight is four drachms. The coin was *four drachms* of silver. In the 30th chapter of Exodus it is commanded that year by year every male above twenty years of age should pay for the service of the tabernacle, half a shekel. Thence arose the question in the gospel, whether the *two drachms* which the law had assigned to the temple, should be given to the Romans. The symbol on the one side is, the Rod of Aaron, which signifies the law or doctrine; and on the same side are inscribed the words, "Holy Jerusalem." On the other side the symbol is the Cup of Incense, which signifies the offering, that is, true prayer; and the inscription is, "Shekel of Israel."

[From the Archives of Schwerin, col. 1271, No. 60.]

3. *To the Most Illustrious D. Hieronymus Baumgartnerus, distinguished for learning, wisdom, and virtue, Senator of the renowned City of Nuremberg, his very dear friend, with best salutations.*

Although I know that God has bestowed on created things their forces, and I do not undervalue physical signs and causes; yet I am also most decidedly of opinion that God, the Eternal Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the most free author of nature, directly modifies the operation of most things, and prevents many sad events. I myself have proved it by experience. And I often think of our first parents; who, after the fall, being deserted by all favourable causes, were, notwithstanding, divinely recreated. And I might write many things regarding this opinion, which I have also sometimes expressed in verse:

Ipsa etiam quamvis adamanti incisa feruntur,
Cum petimus, cedunt fata severa Deo,

Nec Deus est numen, Parcarum carcere clausum,
 Quale putabatur Stoicus esse Deus,
 Ipse potest solis currus inhibere volantes,
 Ipse velut scopulis flumina stare jubet.

"The stern fates, though said to be engraved in adamant,
 At our request yield to the will of God.
 Nor is God a deity immured in the dungeon of destiny,
 Such as the Stoic deemed God to be,
 He can curb the flying coursers of the sun ;
 He commands the floods to stand up like rocks."

Take then in regard to your son this consolation: "*The generation of just men shall be blessed.*" Genesis, [*i. e.* his nativity,] as he himself sees, threatens dangers; and it will not be so slow as you think.* If you do not wish him to be appointed to some high office in the state, the safest thing for his life, and as it were a kind of retreat, would seem to be, philosophy. In this way there would be less reason to be afraid of danger to him. But of this, I will write more at another time. The camp of the Lycaonians is still in the neighbourhood of the city of Brunswick, and the army is hard pressed. But there is no want of money. '*It certainly has others providing supplies;*' but let us pray that God may be with us. Farewell.—8th August (1538).

PHILIP MELANTHUM.

[Nuremberg. Panzer's Collection of Melancthon's Autograph Letters.]

4. *To the Reverend D. Besolt, distinguished for learning and virtue, teaching the gospel piously and faithfully in the Church of God, in the renowned city of Nuremberg, his dearly beloved Brother with best salutations.*

Reverend and dearest Brother, I have not been able to write much amidst such a pressure of engagements; but I send some pages, and have enclosed with this letter my questions which I shewed in manuscript to Luther many years ago, and to which he subjoined answers written with his own hand. I have altered nothing; and Paulus has a copy taken from Luther's autograph. Moreover, although he does not touch on everything in regard to which D. Osiander now raises a dispute; yet, what would have been Luther's opinion, can from this document with certainty be understood. Pray let me know whether you have received those missives. Wishing you health and happiness. On the day of the vernal equinox, 1551.

PHILIP MELANTHON.

[Nuremberg Cod. which has on the back, "*Writings contemporary with Luther.*" The MS. has the following note on the margin:—"I wrote the following letter from the handwriting of Philip." The letter is connected with the promise (C. R. VII. 726), given in that of the 22d January.]

5. *To the Most Honourable John Boson of Mansfeld, distinguished for learning and virtue, his Friend at Nuremberg, with kind salutations.*

I could have wished, both for the sake of the Commonwealth, and

* Melancthon was a believer in Astrology, to which there may be some reference in the above obscure sentence.—ED. B. & F. E. R.

for the good of his sons, that longer life had been granted to their father, Geuderus ; and truly also, for his own sake, I could have wished that he might have longer enjoyed the sight of sons whose talents and pursuits were to him a source of pleasure. You, also, are grieved for a youthful son, removed by an untimely death. But, knowing as we do, that these events do not happen by chance, let us yield obedience to the will of God, and alleviate our sorrow by this true consolation, which is given by God, and which we ought, with entire acquiescence, cordially to accept : ‘ *Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord.*’ Moreover, considering that with genuine piety they worshipped the Son of God, and in fervent prayers commended themselves to him, we congratulate them after the manner of the heavenly church. Let us, also, be confirmed by their example, so that a greater longing may be kindled within us for that delightful meeting, where we shall learn to follow the blessed ways of that wisest of all assemblies. As these things are well known to you, I write the more briefly ; and I pray that the Son of God may preserve and guide the surviving members of your family. And forasmuch as the father in that last agony, whose voice has the highest authority, commended his sons to you ; I know that you, with the greatest care and constancy, will perform the duty devolved upon you ; so that your fidelity in a trust so great may be approved by all. As regards the State, you may know that the insurrection of Count Volrad * threatens great dangers to your fatherland, and to the neighbouring country, which may God avert ! Amidst these commotions, let us take care of the church. Farewell.—On the x. day of October 1552.

[Nuremberg, MSS. of Strobelius, II. fol. 42.]

6. *To Nicolas Bromias of Francfort, in the Academy of Padua, his very dear friend, greeting.*

This letter, dearest Nicolas, I have written in my† house at Francfort, as I was travelling in the train of the Duke of Saxony, who came hither to decide between us and our adversaries. The matter as yet has not been settled, seeing that the French have dissented from the party here. I will, therefore, write more at large of the issue of the Convention after its close. Although I hope God will be with us ; yet whether this summer will prove a peaceful one, I very much doubt. Your mother is anxiously longing for you. I myself have exhorted her to recall you to Germany ; because I judge that on many accounts you have need of forensic practice, and of the habit of speaking and writing in the style of a senator. For this purpose, these disputations with the youths (?) will prepare you ; but about this my plan, I will write more fully after a few days. These youths of the French nation are liberally educated ; pray shew them, although they are new guests, the usual hospitality. Farewell. May your

* Volrad of Mansfeld, son of Count Albert, in the war against the Bishop of Magdeburg.

† Ought it not to be *thy* house ?

flock, through the beneficence of God be safe ! We long to see you.
4. 1539.

[After the original in the Hamburg MS. Autograph Letters of Learned Men. The recipient of the letter has written on it, "I received this at Padua on the 4th January 1539." This date does not agree, however, with the arrangement according to which Melancthon commenced his journey to Frankfurt in the beginning of February.]

8. *Fragment of a Letter to John Calvin, written, but as it seems, not sent. From the Original.*

Greeting,—How shall I give counsel to others, dearest Calvin, when I myself stand in need of receiving counsel. Nevertheless, I have, to the best of my ability, explained, in the pages which you will read, my opinion concerning the strong and the weak. By giving which opinion, I do not place my judgment above yours, and as I wish that we may be united in our sentiments in this life, I hope that both of us together in the eternal life, in a more tranquil school, shall see face to face the same Master, the Son of God. To our Pericles, I have not shewn your letters, nor have I said anything to him about the matter itself, for many reasons. He would have written something, "*Not against the enemies of Christ, but against the party who favour symbols.*" (οὐ κατὰ τῶν ἐχθρῶν Χριστοῦ, ἀλλὰ κατὰ τῶν τῆς συμβόλων.)

[Library of Zwickau.]

9. *To the most Excellent Joachim Camerarius of Bamberg, his most intimate friend, greeting.*

May Christ bestow upon you, on that honourable matron, your amiable wife, and on your sweet children, good health. And if this be the case with you, I would have you, my dear Joachim, not to be very anxious about other things. You remember that passage of Pindar: '*For every one pleasure, the gods deal out to mortals two pains; of which things, on the one hand, the childish in the world cannot bear the painful, and, on the other hand, good men pick out only the pleasant.*' (ἐν παρ' ἑσλόν πῆματα σύν δύο δαίοντα βροτοῖς ἀθανάτωι τὰ μὲν ὧν οὐ δύνανται νήπιοι κοσμῶ φερεῖν, ἀλλ' ἀγαθοὶ τὰ καλὰ τρέψαντες ἔξω.) And, indeed, it becomes you to select especially the good things and enjoy them, as you are a stranger to those public and horrible commotions among which my ill fate has stranded me. To you, moored as it were in the harbour, is vouchsafed the privilege of enjoying the best of studies. On this felicity you will congratulate yourself, and enjoy those delightful pursuits in which you are so great a proficient. Yet, notwithstanding, I would have even you, for the sake of the public good, not to flee from conflicts and dangers, if we can be of any service. But, believe me, there is no place for our philosophy with those who are so much in love with violent counsels. What do you suppose is my mind when, thinking on the Smalcald Convention, to which, not only the Confederates, but also your Duke, as I hear, and the *demagogues* of other States, are about to proceed? Luther is going to it. There will be deliberations about universal doctrine,—

deliberations which are esteemed worthy to be maintained and preferred to the public tranquillity. Methinks I look just now into the minds, and see the designs of all princes and learned men. I seem to foresee great contests. '*Strong love of strife, and much lack of learning, which are the worst of devils.*' But I do not see what true union it is possible to attain, when the bitterness of animosities is greater among ourselves than that which is felt against the Popish faction. You will expect from me a history of that convention. French affairs, and the interests of the Emperor, I think, will be carried by some others even to it. And now I have no more topics than those which were in your letter. In regard to the Turks, the reports are both certain and sanguinary. Not far from Styria, the Turkish garrisons spread themselves abroad, and committed horrid cruelties. Some thousands of men having been recently drawn out of that country, the women were murdered and mangled with incredible ferocity. In Transylvania, John, with the help of the Turkish troops, has taken the very strongly fortified city Cassonia, and, as a Turkish garrison was placed in it, nearly all the citizens were slain. In the meantime, Christian princes strive and quarrel with one another as to whether it is lawful to eat flesh on Friday, and prepare intestine wars for the most contemptible causes. Is it not apparent, How great calamities these eclipses and comets threaten to the whole earth? It is affirmed that the Turks are preparing an expedition into Germany. It is certain that their advanced guards are widely wasting the German frontiers. Concerning all these affairs, I will write to you more certain information after the convention. Certainly I shall use my best endeavours to prevent my being dragged to that meeting, but fear I shall scarcely be able to keep myself out of it. I have received all your letters, and with them the gift from Blarerus. The delicate state of my health begins now to hinder even my studies of these raving sophists, who slander me in my absence. The veriest trifles have annoyed me, but they sometimes also afford amusement. Arcesilaus was an academician who preferred to put a restraint upon himself (ἐπιείχων), rather than seem too harsh to some friends. Amsdorf has been here, who, you know, is a *dialectician*. He began even to defend some of my propositions, and we could bring him over to our side if we had him among us. For your honourable spouse I send a present, and pray that this year may be, to you and to the country, prosperous and happy. I have no leisure at present to write more. My very dear friend, Farewell. May you enjoy the highest happiness.—20th of January 1587. PHILIP.

I salute the Physician.

[Nuremberg, Cod. of Strobelius, No. IV. fol. 53.]

18. To Justinus Goblerus.

I acknowledge your extreme candour in your suspecting nothing very bad from my silence, and I beg you will persevere in this constant friendship. And I on my part feel an affectionate and sincere regard for you, your genius, your learning, and your goodwill towards

me ; and I love and highly esteem you. I assure you there was no other cause of my long silence except the want of an amanuensis, or unseasonable interruptions. For although a school has its name from σχολη, *leisure*, yet I have precious little leisure for a letter. Of the convention I need not write, as its acts are published. We were beset by ambuscades, placed with sufficient skill, which God has dispersed ; we have answered with moderation and yet with firmness. And truly those painted compromises (*fucosæ conciliationes*), which some prepared with so much labour, could not heal the public discords. Let us, therefore, act as becometh saints, simply and plainly (*simpliciter et plane*) ; and as to the pontiffs, who according to the gospel are two-horned, let them see what they can effect by their wealth and power. They will never make faithful compacts with godly churches. Let us pray that God would reform the churches ; and let every one in his own place help forward the work of true reformation. Farewell
—7th December. PHILIP MELANTHON.

[From the Hamburg Cod. Autograph Letters of Learned Men.]

(From the German.)

28. *To the Honourable, Learned, and distinguished Burgomaster, and the Councillors at Regensburg.*

My Gracious Masters,—The grace of God through his only begotten Son Jesus Christ our Saviour be with you. First, I beg your worships, as men of understanding, not to look unfavourably on my communications ; for you know that I am bound to promote, to the best of my ability in this my calling, the studies of youth. I desire your worships, therefore, to know that the bearers of this letter, Nicolas Marius and Wolfgang Seitentaler, have by the grace of God prosecuted their studies well, and in a praiseworthy manner, according to the ability of their age ; so that the hope may be entertained that they will be able to serve in their time the Christian government, especially if they continue and complete the course of study they have so well begun. I beg your worships, therefore, graciously to grant help for this end. Your worships, as men of understanding, and devoted to the furtherance of the divine glory, know that God has charged rulers with this duty of charity ; so that the Christian religion may be spread abroad and maintained ; and he will graciously reward them. For, your worships see what distress there is in France, Hungary, Italy, the Netherlands, England, and Scotland, where the Christian religion has for a long time been persecuted, and is yet terribly maligned. It is just, therefore, that we should thank God that he has so graciously spared Germany for the sake of his precious gospel ; and we ought on that account to value it and truly to further it, that God may be rightly worshipped, and the Saviour Jesus Christ rightly honoured, and many people sanctified and saved. May God grant this ! May your worships be pleased to grant ready help to the youth of your city in their studies ; and look for your reward from God, who will indeed richly recompense this kind of generosity, although the work is not so great. May he at all times

protect your church and city! Amen.—Given at Wittemberg, 9th September 1544. Your worships' obedient servant,

PHILIP MELANTHON.

[From the Regensburg Archives.]

(*From the German.*)

29. *To the Same.*

The grace of God through his only begotten Son Jesus Christ our Saviour and true Helper, be with you! Honourable, learned, distinguished, gracious sirs, your worships know, as praiseworthy Christian governors, that our Saviour Jesus Christ has said: 'Suffer little children to come unto me; for of such is the kingdom of heaven.' The maintenance of Christian schools is, therefore, highly necessary, and the Son of God himself will give help to your worships in that, and protect your beloved youth, and grant his Holy Spirit, that your children may learn rightly to call upon God. For this reason I earnestly invoke and entreat him with you; since your worships have desired to obtain an active man for the management of your schools and the education of your youth, assisted by the counsel of the learned M. Joachim Camerarius and M. Nicolas Gallus, who was a preacher in your church, and is at present with us, and by others; I will send to your worships an active man at the next Leipsic fair; and I trust your worships will not take in ill part my short letter; for I must set off this hour for an assembly at which the Elector of Brandenburg will have certain communications made in the interests of religion. May our Saviour Jesus Christ graciously direct and guard your worships, and his poor Christendom in all places! And I am your worships' willing servant.—Wittemberg, 16th December 1548.

PHILIP MELANTHON.

[From the Regensburg City Archives.]

X. GENERAL LITERATURE.

William Blake. A Critical Essay. By ALGERNON CHARLES SWINBURNE. London: John Camden Hotten. 1868.

Let us frankly confess that we do not quite understand Blake, while there is much that we admire in his amiable character, and in his strange and beautiful work. Indeed, we are not sure that he ought to be wholly understood in a rational way. Mr Swinburne has assumed the office of interpreter, but his interpretation does not materially assist us on those very points where we are most at sea. Through defect of sympathy with the fundamentally Christian spirituality of his subject, he is also somewhat of a blind guide. We accept him as a highly qualified critic of Blake's weird powers of de-

signing, and especially of his exquisite lyrical faculty; but he is not a partaker in his faith, and cannot even vaguely discern it as the spring of his action. Only imagine the wanton singer of "*Laus Veneris*" giving any intelligent assent to such sentiments as these: "I still and shall through eternity embrace Christianity, and adore Him who is the express image of God; but I have travelled through perils and darkness not unlike a champion. I have conquered, and shall go on conquering. Nothing can withstand the fury of my course among the stars of God and in the abysses of the accuser. I must do my endeavour to live to the glory of our Lord and Saviour—if I myself omit any duty to my station as a soldier of Christ, it gives me the greatest of torments." And yet these passages are taken from those ten late recovered letters of Blake's, which his critic regards as the key to his whole life and work. They were written in his forty-fifth year, when his mind, we may presume, was moderately well made up, upon things both general and particular, and about the time he was composing those transcendental allegories, in which his critic finds chiefly a congenial paganism. It would certainly be difficult to infer, from this elaborate essay, that its subject was anyway concerned with Christianity, except as a mark to be shot at.

The high favour into which the poor visionary artist is lately come—the posthumous fame now tardily overtaking him—is one of the signs of the times, to which we would do well to give heed. Until his biography, written by the late Mr Gilchrist, and edited, with selections from his works, by the brothers Rossetti, made its noticeable appearance, about five years ago, William Blake was either unknown or misapprehended, save by a discerning few. That book first brought us face to face with the strangely-endowed and child-hearted man, and enabled those living nigh forty years after his death to see him as he could not have been fully seen even by his contemporaries. As an artist, he was too original to be acceptable to the conventional taste, and too hopelessly egregious to follow meekly the Academician bell-wethers of his day, but he used to console himself by asserting, in his own eccentric way, that there were chambers in heaven filled with his pictures, and that archangels delighted to look upon them. Putting aside celestial fame for the nonce, there is no longer any question of the terrestrial, now that some of the most competent of our art critics have ranked his productions with those of Dürer and Buonarroti. Of his artistic performances, about the best known are the illustrations to Blair's poem of "*The Grave*," and about the grandest, the Inventions to the Book of Job; but he was more distinguished as a colourist than as an accurate delineator of form. He was eminently an inventive genius; and when he singled out for approbation some of the second or third-rate painters around him, it was because they possessed in degree the indispensable qualities of imagination and invention, without which the highest proficiency in construction or manipulation was nothing. His own greatest deficiencies, however, were just in the adequate expression of his lofty conceptions. Many of his suggestive ideas and splendid fancies may be adapted—we will not say adopted—by others more accomplished in the graces or technicalities of art, by those whose cultivated talent must serve them instead of genius.

But let that pass ; in our opinion we shall have more to do with Blake's influence on modern thought, and his place in literature, before all is done. That influence, we believe, will be wholesome, so soon as his character shall have been asserted in its integrity. In reading this critical essay, we feel that he has fallen among thieves ; and we fear that the priest and the Levite may pass him on either side, and certainly, it must be owned, he was no especial friend of their order. Much of his worth and excellence has already been declared by artistic experts, but his title has yet to be vindicated to the world as one of the children—it may be a somewhat wayward one—of the kingdom of heaven.

As a poet, Blake lived in a clear musical atmosphere, far above the scanning versifiers of his dull generation, from which, indeed, he stands apart, as remote from all its thoughts and ways, as he is at once near to the models of our early poesy, and near to the spirit of our own age. His earlier pieces, however, are incomparably the best. Of these, Mr Rossetti remarks, with a rare perfection of critical sensibility, that “ they afford many instances of that exquisite metrical gift and rightness in point of form which constitute Blake's special glory among his contemporaries, even more eminently perhaps than the grander command of mental resources, which is also his. Such qualities of pure perfection in writing verse, as he perpetually, without effort, displayed, are to be met with among those elder poets whom he loved, and such again are now looked upon as the peculiar trophies of a school which has arisen since his time ; but he alone (let it be repeated and remembered) possessed them then, and possessed them in clear completeness. Colour and metre, these are the true patents of nobility in painting and poetry, taking precedence of all intellectual claims ; and, it is by virtue of these, first of all, that Blake holds, in both arts, a rank which cannot be taken from him.” This is fitly spoken of the manner and form, but what of the matter and the informing spirit ? Is art a means or an end—a channel of high communion—a conduit of base emotion ? or, in itself, whether well or ill employed, a chief good and final aim ? Mr Swinburne, in the course of this essay, following Mr Robert Buchanan to his logical conclusion, eliminates morality from art, and the thing is easily done ; but much as he dislikes the phrase, art may just as readily be made “ the handmaid of religion ” as the minister of sin. It is merely a question of use or abuse ; and its discussion in connection with Blake, with a view to justify the perversion of art, is peculiarly unhappy. He was pre-eminently one who sought not his own, but the things of God, that he might render them in art. To have done otherwise would have implied that very Atheism which he often so impatiently denounced. Any of our readers at all familiar with the “ most supersensuous of the sons of art,” will hold this a superfluous vindication of his faith and works ; but these have been impugned, and we only trust some approved champion will accept the challenge. Others, yet unacquainted with him, may perhaps judge somewhat both of his letter and spirit, and be excited to a fuller intimacy, from such examples of his poetry as we can here insert. From the “ Songs of Innocence and Experience ” we take a poem, entitled “ The Little Black Boy,” which

is a fair specimen of the whole. Well and truly did Mr Gilchrist say of it, that for nobler depth of religious beauty, with accordant grandeur of sentiment and language, he knew no parallel nor hint elsewhere.

“ My mother bore me in the southern wild,
And I am black, but oh my soul is white.
White as an angel is the English child ;
But I am black, as if bereaved of light.

“ My mother taught me, underneath a tree ;
And, sitting down before the heat of day,
She took me in her lap and kissed me,
And, pointing to the east, began to say :

“ ‘ Look on the rising sun ; there God does live,
And gives his light, and gives his heat away ;
And flowers and trees, and beasts and men receive
Comfort in morning, joy in the noon-day.

“ ‘ And we are put on earth a little space,
That we may learn to bear the beams of love ;
And these black bodies, and this sunburnt face,
Are but a cloud, and like a shady grove.

“ ‘ For when our souls have learnt the heat to bear,
The cloud will vanish, we shall hear His voice
Saying, Come out from the grove, my love and care,
And round my golden tent like lambs rejoice.’

“ Thus did my mother say, and kissed me ;
And thus I say to little English boy :
When I from black and he from white cloud free,
And round the tent of God like lambs we joy,

“ I ’ll shade him from the heat, till he can bear
To lean in joy upon our Father’s knee ;
And then I ’ll stand and stroke his silver hair,
And be like him, and he will then love me.”

It were wasteful and ridiculous excess to gild this refined gold with the base alloy of applauding criticism. What is called “ pointing out the beauties ” is at all times an exceedingly distasteful ordeal, for the good singer finds a fit audience ; it is unnecessary with good poetry, it is impossible with bad. Regarding another composition, however, which we are about to transcribe, we are within our province when we ask the reader to ponder it heedfully, as being more indicative of the special idiosyncracies of its author than any single piece we can quote. It contains touches of that obscurity which afterwards almost hopelessly enveloped his muse—signs of the condensing of that intellectual mist through which she assumed such dim Titanic proportions ; but it is full of the large and sensitive charity, and genuine spiritual philosophy of one who was not worldly-wise in his generation. There is here that “ reverence for inferiors ” which is cherished in the soul of the truly great, to whom nothing is insignificant.

" AUGURIES OF INNOCENCE.

*" To see a world in a grain of sand,
And a Heaven in a wild flower ;
Hold Infinity in the palm of your hand,
And Eternity in an hour.*

" A robin redbreast in a cage,
Puts all heaven in a rage ;
A dove-house, filled with doves and pigeons,
Shudders hell through all its regions ;
A dog starved at his master's gate,
Predicts the ruin of the State ;
A game-cock clipped and armed for fight,
Doth the rising sun affright ;
A horse misused upon the road,
Calls to heaven for human blood ;
Every wolf's and lion's howl,
Raises from hell a human soul ;
Each outcry of the hunted hare,
A fibre from the brain doth tear ;
A skylark wounded on the wing,
Doth make a cherub cease to sing.

" He who shall hurt the little wren,
Shall never be beloved by men ;
He who the ox to wrath has moved,
Shall never be by woman loved ;
He who shall train the horse to war,
Shall never pass the Polar Bar ;
The wanton boy that kills the fly,
Shall feel the spider's enmity ;
He who torments the chafer's sprite,
Weaves a bower in endless night ;
The caterpillar on the leaf,
Repeats to thee thy mother's grief ;
The wild deer wandering here and there,

Keep the human soul from care ;
The lamb misused breeds public strife,
And yet forgives the butcher's knife.
Kill not the moth nor butterfly,
For the last judgment draweth nigh ;
The beggar's dog, and widow's cat,
Feed them, and thou shalt grow fat.
Every tear from every eye
Becomes a babe in eternity ;
The bleat, the bark, bellow, and roar,
Are waves that beat on heaven's shore.

" The bat that flits at close of eve,
Has left the brain that won't believe ;
The owl that calls upon the night,
Speaks the unbeliever's fright ;
The gnat that sing's his summer's song
Poison gets from slander's tongue ;
The poison of the snake and newt
Is the sweat of envy's foot ;

The poison of the honey bee
Is the artist's jealousy :
The strongest poison ever known
Came from Cæsar's laurel-crown.

" Nought can deform the human race
Like to the armourer's iron brace ;
The soldier armed with sword and gun,
Palsied strikes the summer's sun ;
When gold and gems adorn the plough,
To peaceful arts shall envy bow ;
The beggar's rags, fluttering in the air,

Do to rags the heavens tear ;
The prince's robes and beggar's rags
Are toadstools on the miser's bags ;
One mite wrung from the labourer's hands

Shall buy and sell the miser's lands,
Or, if protected from on high,
Shall that whole nation sell and buy ;
The poor man's farthing is worth more
Than all the gold on Afric's shore.
The whore and gambler, by the State
Licenced, build that nation's fate ;
The harlot's cry from street to street,
Shall weave old England's winding-sheet ;

The winner's shout, the loser's curse,
Shall dance before dead England's hearse.

" He who mocks the infant's faith
Shall be mocked in age and death ;
He who shall teach the child to doubt
The rotting grove shall ne'er get out ;
He who respects the infant's faith
Triumphs over hell and death ;
The babe is more than swaddling bands

Throughout all these human lands.
Tools were made, and born were hands,

Every farmer understands.
The questioner who sits so sly
Shall never know how to reply ;
He who replies to words of doubt
Doth put the light of knowledge out ;
A puddle, or the cricket's cry,
Is to doubt a fit reply ;
The child's toys, and the old man's reasons,
Are the fruits of the two seasons :

The emmet's inch and eagle's mile
 Make lame philosophy to smile ;
 A truth that's told with bad intent
 Beats all the lies you can invent,
 He who doubts from what he sees
 Will ne'er believe, do what you
 please ;
 If the sun and moon should doubt,
 They'd immediately go out.

" Every night and every morn
 Some to misery are born ;
 Every morn and every night
 Some are born to sweet delight :
 Some are born to sweet delight,
 Some are born to endless night.
 Joy and woe are wove fine,
 A clothing for the soul divine ;

Under every grief and pine
 Runs a joy with silken twine.
 It is right it should be so ;
 Man was made for joy and woe ;
 And when this we rightly know,
 Safely through the world we go.

" We are led to believe a lie
 When we see *with*, not *through* the
 eye,
 Which was born in a night to perish
 in a night
 When the soul slept in beams of light.
 God appears and God is light
 To those poor souls who dwell in
 night ;
 But doth a human form display
 To those who dwell in realms of day."

We might have instanced a better example of the poet, but not consistently with our desire to shew more of the man ; and we might have abridged our quotation, but to have done so would have been equivalent to dropping a bar in music. It is quite open to the admirer of more laboured verse to point out the demerits in execution, as it is to the practical man to say that there is here a disproportion between ideas and facts. The opening lines, for instance, referring to the rage of heaven, seem ridiculous from the prosaic standpoint of such as only recognise the market value of the two sparrows that are sold for a farthing, and cannot see that they are under Fatherly care. But we are in danger of losing the allusive grace of these poetic images, if we examine too closely their literal basis. It is lost time to attempt the reconciliation of blank literalism with the spirituality of Blake. Those who dwell in realms of natural day may look at him with all their might, but they will never see him ; and better so, than that they should seek for him in the second circle of Dante's *Inferno*, whither Mr Swinburne has in theory conducted him, as the prophet of sensual indulgence—the priest of Queen Semiramis, who sought to " make the lustful licit by her law."

A very high degree of ingenuity has been brought by the writer of this essay to the elucidation of the so-called prophetic books of the gentle visionary ; and we are willing to admit that he has made some crooked things straight, while making the reading public partially acquainted with those rare and extraordinary works. In the interests of literature we second his desire, that the whole of Blake's works may yet be collected and published under competent editorship. Hitherto they can hardly be said to have received publication at all, owing to the slow and laborious method of their production ; every word having been engraved on copper with pictorial borders, which were afterwards illuminated with marvellous effects of colour by the hand of the author himself. And as to the editorship notwithstanding all that we have alleged against Mr Swinburne (whose talents and culture, apart from their employment, we cannot but admire), we shall stretch a point in his favour, and say that if he could once get rid of his moral perversity, and catch even a momentary glimpse of

the faith which animated William Blake—and like a more highly gifted being, he “aiblines might,”—few men, so amended, would be better qualified for the task. We have no wish, however, to witness his transformation, even into angelic light, if done with sinister intent, or mere dramatic purpose. In default, therefore, of that luminous interpretation which we barely desiderate, we think that the best editing of the prophetic books in particular would be that which simply gave an accurate text, and told the circumstances of their appearance. Those wild and tumultuous rhapsodies, thronged with emblematical conceits, may well defy all commentary. To strive to bring order out of their primordial chaos is to destroy them. “Allegory addressed to the intellectual powers, while it is altogether hidden from the corporeal understanding,” is the author’s definition of the most sublime poetry, and if lacking in scientific exactness, it is sufficiently intelligible to such as are happily ignorant of the proprieties of metaphysical jargon. In any case it proximately indicates the line of his own endeavours, although he regarded fable or allegory as an inferior kind of poetry as compared with real vision. He loved to clothe himself in clouds and darkness—darkness visible only by the red glare of fire and flame which to him were the symbols of purifying holiness—and he would have spurned the man who sought to bring a cold white light to the analysis of his sibylline oracles. Still more would he have revolted at a pagan construction being put upon them, as the whole tenour of his career and character satisfactorily attests. Let us hear himself:—“The stolen and perverted writings of Homer and Ovid, of Plato and Cicero, which all men ought to contemn, are set up by artifice against the sublime of the Bible;—Shakspeare and Milton were both curbed by the general malady and infection from the silly Greek and Latin slaves of the sword. We do not want either Greek or Roman models if we are but just and true to our own imaginations, those worlds of eternity in which we shall live for ever in Jesus our Lord.” Such words are not perhaps remarkable either for critical or theological accuracy, but they adequately exhibit the temper of the writer. They are taken from the preface to his *Milton*, and are immediately followed by these beautiful lines, which (albeit not strictly illustrative of the position), we cannot resist transcribing:—

“ And did those feet in ancient time
Walk over England’s mountains green ?
And was the holy Lamb of God
On England’s pleasant pastures seen ?
“ And did the countenance divine
Shine forth upon our clouded hills ?
And was Jerusalem builded here
Among these dark Satanic mills ?
“ Bring me my bow of burning gold ;
Bring me my arrows of desire ;
Bring me my spear ; O clouds, unfold,
Bring me my chariot of fire.
“ I will not cease from mental fight,
Nor shall my sword sleep in my hand,
Till we have built Jerusalem,
In England’s green and pleasant land.”

We think it is a mistake to convey a surreptitious logic into the heavenly rhetoric of Blake—to attempt the reduction of those grand oratorios of his to a dogmatic system, be it either mythological or doctrinal. We feel convinced that the erratic seer himself would not have so applied a measuring rod, or weights and scales, to the visions of his exalted imagination. And neither could he, had he so willed, in any explicit or intelligible way; for his powers of expression and articulation, magnificent withal, were but feeble familiars, utterly unable to keep pace with the headlong fury of his inspiration. “If not asked, I know; but attempting to explain, I know not;” these believing words of St Augustine might have been his reply to over-curious inquirers.

But if all this be so, what are we to make of this nebulous phenomenon in the firmament of art? Indisputably there is here a psychological study for which we do not possess the requisite capacity, and cannot even frame into definite propositions to lay before the reader. Nevertheless we are conscious of a wonderful unity and consistency in the character of Blake. This much, we think, may be surely said of him, that he was a mystic, a pantheist of the Asiatic type, and yet a monotheist of the Hebraic; a contemner alike of the pride of reason, and the sordid thralldom of sense, as of the saving efficacy of creeds or legal works in themselves, and the sufficiency of external ordinances by themselves; but beyond all, in a manner, and to a degree not recognised by his biographer and critics, he was essentially a Christian. He is a standing protest against Rationalism and Materialism, as well as against superstition; and his growing ascendancy, as presently descried, we take to signify a return to spiritual belief. The now aggressive philosophy of Auguste Comte, as only fully developed in the person of its founder, eventuated in a religion more or less spiritual as it more or less faintly resembled its fundamentally Christian pattern; and those of his English disciples, who are now engrossed with the material aspects of positivism, may shortly be expected to cast about in order to satisfy the spiritual craving of the human soul. Indications of this temper are apparent in the spiritual heresies and impostures now abroad. To Blake, however, the vulgar spiritualism of mediums and *seances* was altogether unknown, and would have been to him anathema. His was the essential spirituality of the Christian faith. It is true that he described visions and incorporeal interviews much in the manner of Swedenborg, whose works he had read, but disapproved, but his biographer is careful to shew that he did not affect supernatural gifts, in the ordinary sense of the term. In the true supernaturalism, which is over and above, and within and below all things, he was, however, a firm believer, carnally discerning nothing. The material universe was to him but the vesture of the Almighty. He would worship God alone, and not nature, which was but a veil, blinding the atheist. “I find nature abominably in my way,” he was wont to exclaim. Quite consistently, therefore, we find in him the enemy of ceremonial laws and sacerdotal theories, and of all the devices of religious formalism. Laws and philosophies, rites and ceremonies, were garments ready to be moth-eaten, meanwhile chiefly impeding the action of the soul. The vehemence of his attacks upon

matters adventitiously associated with Christianity, and the bold intemperance of his language on sacred subjects—the latter not justifiable without such explanation as we have yet to get—are not construed by his annotators in the spiritual sense alone proper to them. They incontinently hail him as a grand heresiarch, and rejoice over a great accession to their ranks. Heretical he assuredly was in respect of mere established forms which intercepted his spiritual view; but just on account of the overwhelming spirituality of his faith, which was impatient of all extraneous aids. Commoner men, however, had best keep to the forms necessary to the support of their feeble knees. Faith was to him the only true sight, and that only was holy to him which was incorruptible. He honestly believed himself to be holy in St Paul's sense, as a temple of God; and his intolerance of law is best explainable in the same sense: When the commandment came, sin revived, and I died." It was not so much law itself as legality that he repudiated. The liberty he rejoiced in was that wherewith Christ had made him free; and his violence was that whereby the kingdom of heaven was to be forcibly taken, but there is no warrant for that presumptuous licence which some passages in his writings have been held to imply. He does not, strictly speaking, come under the category of Antinomianism; and his language as to the evil of abstinence, and the beauty of gratified desire,—terms, in his typical vocabulary, synonymous with idleness on the one hand, and achievement on the other—is to be taken in the sense in which he disallows corporeal strife, while yet, with the Psalmist, he prays that his hands may be taught to war. The same idea is thus otherwise expressed by him: "Energy is eternal delight." Neither did he practically set himself against the church, although he said hard things of her, for he declared his preference for ecclesiastical government. Priestcraft, we find him saying, is not so bad as soldiercraft and lawyercraft. He did, however, assert an individual freedom of action independent of the common conscience, but then he utterly ignored the existence of baser instincts. Those whose god is their belly need not hope to find any advocacy here, be it explicit or implicit, of their idolatry. He was, furthermore, an egotist, but his was the egotism of one surcharged with a revelation of truth, with which he had identified himself. Of such egotism as Blake, through all his meekly borne poverty, ever seriously betrayed, we may behold the final absorption set forth in these strong words of the purest Christian mysticism:—

"When will the Resurrection come to deliver the sleeping body
From corruptibility? Oh when, Lord Jesus, wilt thou come?
Tarry no longer; for my soul lies at the gates of death:
I will arise and look forth for the morning of the grave;
I will go down to the sepulchre and see if morning breaks.
I will go down to self-annihilation and eternal death,
Lest the last Judgment come and find me unannihilate,
And I be seized and given into the hands of my own selfhood."

In forming our estimate of this extraordinary man, and in judging of the mark he has left on the world, we entirely disclaim the assumption, in so far as these mere hints may briefly convey our opinion, of any authoritative speech; for there is much in our subject eluding all

such analysis as we can attempt. There is a lamentable incoherence and incongruity in much of his written work, not even to receive elucidation from the wealth of illustrative design which encompasses almost every page of it. In the case of those epico-dramatic allegories, we conceive that their inexplicable character is mechanically heightened by the fragmentary style in which, for the most part, they have yet been given to us by editors and critics, who, with special theories of their own to exemplify, have also given rise to no small misconception. We have no hesitation in saying that, in the present instance, Mr Swinburne acts as a disturbing medium; if, indeed, in appropriating his subject as a vehicle for the conveyance of his own ideas, he be not chargeable with malversation. The fact remains, nevertheless, and cannot be overgotten, that there is an almost inextricable confusion throughout all the more lengthy and pretentious compositions of Blake, and we must await their rehearsal in that Beulah of his, "where contrarities are equally true." We must reach that spiritual age in which "the five senses" are not, as in this, "the chief inlets of the soul," before we can read all his bewildering paradoxes. We cannot thread our way through those labyrinthine chambers of imagery, or decipher their flaming hieroglyphics. Especially in respect of the prophetic books, it may be said, with a confusion of metaphor befitting the occasion, that the music of those orchestral symphonies reveals only the mood of the composer. They prescribe no laws for codification, and we come back to the point we started from, that Blake is not to be wholly understood. "Such things," writes Mr Swinburne, "and the expression of such things, as are here treated of, are not to be reasoned out; the matter, one may say, is above reasoning; the manner (taken apart from the matter) is below it. All is, of course, more or less symbolic, and not to be taken in literal coarseness or folly of meaning." Excellent advice, which the giver might have taken to himself, for, in sifting these myths too closely, has he not after all been winnowing water with wind, and weighing clouds in a scale?

LAICUS.

On Certain Theosophic Ideas of the East. A Paper read before the Liverpool Literary and Philosophical Society, April 20. 1868.
By the REV. W. KENNEDY MOORE, M.A. (*Printed in the Society's Transactions.*)

In this interesting paper Mr Moore has, in a few significant words, pointed out some of the characteristic features of the philosophical systems which substantially underlie the absurdities of Hindu Mythology. The leading ideas of Eastern speculation, which are strictly matters of metaphysical belief, are passed in review, under a diffusive light of Western thought. Such weighty matters cannot, of course, be exhaustively treated in a brief sketch, but they are here indicated with the judgment and delicacy of one who is equally familiar with his subject, and alive to its relative bearings. Its proper religious aspects are not presented, but they are discernible in the mind of the writer, through the theological undercurrent of his design. The term

“theosophic” is aptly here employed, whether as referring to the divine illumination contended for by the Brahminical sages, or to the theological element inherent in the Indian philosophy. “In oriental countries,” it is observed, “and particularly in India, where the genius of the people is subtle and meditative; religious theories have been numerous and philosophic; and it is to these speculations that we give the name of theosophy. It is in great part what we should call philosophy, but mixed up with religious formulas, and claiming sacred authority.”

After a preliminary survey, critical and historical, this essay proceeds to shew, in regard to Hinduism, that the earliest sacred books—the Vedas—signalise the epoch of a concrete faith in elemental deities; and that a more speculative period subsequently developed an abstract theosophy. Eliminating from the later sacred books of the Hindus, the tales mythological and the details ceremonial, Mr Moore finds a large residuum of the speculative cast; and it is from these that he derives his materials. They are full of conflicting theories, however, of which no minute examination or reconciliation is attempted. The salient points are alone remarked.

The metaphysical puzzles of space and time are first taken up. According to the Hindu idea, we are told, that space is an original element of bodies, ranking with the other elements of fire, air, earth, and water; and we are not sure that this is quite unintelligible to men of obtuser European intellect. The theory concerning time is one of measurement, and receives illustration from the revolutions of the heavenly bodies, as well as from the mechanism of a clock. All things move in cycles, and the whole of time is measured out by revolving periods. This is the theory, not so simple as it looks, except as all truths are simple when once discovered, as a secret loses its interest on being divulged. But the strange peculiarity in the eastern idea is this, that each ultimate cycle is considered as the unvaried and unvariable repetition of the same identical phenomena. It is not unlikely that the whole material universe is under cyclic law, but unless each great cycle of the Indian theory be regarded as exhausting all possible phases of phenomena, what are we to make of our poor western notions of continuity, development, and progress?

The other paragraphs, constituting the bulk of this learned paper, are concerned with the question of Being, in itself, and in its ultimate grounds and conditions. What is it that exists, and what relations are there between such things as do exist? Eastern theosophy concisely answers by asserting the unity of Being. We have come to regard the universe as one great whole, of which all the parts and processes are bound together by the closest links, rather than as a vast congeries of systems of bodies and groups of phenomena. In short, the cosmical idea is that of the unity of the physical universe. But man is also reflectively conscious of a higher inward nature, and with this comes the conviction that soul or spirit in some infinite form must of necessity exist. What therefore is the relation of the supreme spirit to the physical universe, and what man's relation to the infinite spirit? The fundamental theosophic idea blends the atomic theory with pantheism, developing all things from a primal molecule endowed

with vital principle, and recognising the identity of the Supreme Being and the universe. This theory that God and the world are one, is held both in a materialistic and in an idealistic sense, and Mr Moore follows it up to its ultimate expansion into mysticism, tracing also its points of analogy to theism. The material construction makes matter equally with mind constituents of Deity, the ideal denies the existence of anything except a supreme thinking mind. According to the first view, whatever exists is part and parcel of the effluence of the divine germ, and an integral portion of its developed existence. In one word, all things are God. At this point in his thesis, the reverend author very needfully counsels the wisdom and moderation of a liberal culture, as being indispensable in those who would approach this metaphysical religion from the Christian side. It has been well remarked of the acknowledged and lamentable failure of missionary efforts among the Chinese, that their Christian instructors do not sufficiently inform themselves of what their heathen scholars already know, and that they give prominence to doctrines irreconcilable with the soundest parts of the old philosophy of China, and with the ethical instructions of its wisest men. Alluding to the last doctrine under discussion, Mr Moore pertinently remarks, that, "However alien such a theory may be from our modes of thought, and however erroneous we may believe it to be, it becomes us at least to understand what it is before pronouncing on it. We hear a good many people," he continues, "making themselves exceedingly merry at the notion of 'those black fellows' believing in such an insane absurdity as that a stone was God, or a stick was God. The only amusing thing about it is the ignorance and conceit of those white fellows who make such remarks. When a grave, learned, and dignified Brahmin gives utterance to his religious faith in such a form of creed, we may at least suppose that, however far astray he may be, there must yet be something in his belief that recommends it to his reason, and that he cannot attach credence to a mere string of futilities. What he says is, not that everything is God,—that is, that each individual object is the whole of deity,—but that all things are one God, or in other words, that the entire universe is included in the Infinite Being." But leaving the material ground, we come next to the idealistic school which occupies an apparently antagonistic position. To the idealist there is no such thing as matter, or worlds, or men, or aught else. There is only one who exists, and all things that men commonly deem actual and real, are nothing but delusion. God alone is, and all things else are but thoughts of God. It cannot be said that Bishop Berkeley has raised any considerable western cultus of idealism. On the other hand, however, Mr Moore, speaking from personal observation, is astonished to find what a hold this time-honoured theory has taken of the Hindu mind, "so that a poor Coolie, with nothing to cover his dusky person but a penny worth of cotton rag, will gravely assure you that all things are only *maya*, that is, delusion."

The third phase of this eastern pantheism, that which gradually shades off into mysticism, and affects to reconcile conflicting tenets, is by the ingenious writer of this paper denominated the psychical theory, and its principal peculiarities are thus summarily expressed :

—“ The psychical theory recognises the duality of mind and matter, and holds that the spirit of man is more akin to the Supreme than either his bodily frame or anything else material. It does not deny that the physical universe is a portion of the Infinite being, just as the body is part of the man. But the duality which is characteristic of human nature is held to belong equally to the divine. The Supreme Being is regarded less as the organic life of the universe, and more as its intelligent and ruling mind. He is the soul of which the world is the body. With this idea is connected an interesting view of the nature of the human spirit. Each individual soul is regarded as a portion of the great Spirit, disjoined for the time, so as to constitute a separate being. Broken portions of the Infinite Spirit are thus bounded for a season by the limited surroundings of a finite lot ; but by-and-by they shall return and be merged in the Infinite again. This theory of the human spirit lies at the foundation of two celebrated oriental ideas, namely, transmigration and absorption. The first of these is perhaps the best known of all the theosophic ideas the east has produced,” and it is argued, that, it probably recommended itself to men’s minds partly from what they observed in the process of the material world, in which the form of matter changes without the matter being destroyed. It was naturalised by the Greeks under the name of metempsychosis—the soul or psyche being understood to pass from one body into another, and become thus the animating principle of successive physical forms. According to the Indian theory, the portion of the Divine Spirit within an individual is doubly prisoned, first by the outer and coarser shell of the body, and then by an inner integument, which is not material. A somewhat corresponding distinction is made in the Greek Testament between the spiritual man and the carnal man. This inner environment of the spirit consists of the passions and affections of our nature ; and it is our highest duty, say the Hindu sages, to annihilate these, to rid the spirit of the inner bond, and thus at once attain to absorption into the Infinite. Failure in this high endeavour condemns the soul to transmigration, that is, it must re-appear on earth under some form which is determined by the character of its past life in the body. Absorption, however, is the final end of all. The good attain it soon ; the wicked are purified by the purgatorial process of thousands of births till they reach absorption also. “ So familiar,” Mr Moore observes, “ is this idea to the Hindus, that when they see the sufferings of some wretched beast, or hear some tale of misfortune, it is quite common to hear them remark that the sufferer must have sinned grievously in some former birth ; while on the other hand, the wealthy and prosperous are regarded as enjoying the fruits of that merit which they had acquired in a previous existence.” And he significantly adds that “ this idea seems to have been hinted at in the question of the disciples of Jesus, when they asked, ‘ Master, who did sin, *this man* or his parents, that he was born blind ? ’ ”

Absorption, it has been said, is the final end of all. If equivalent to annihilation, however, every sane human instinct might recoil from such a destiny. That the Hindu mind does not so regard it, Mr Moore is satisfied, believing that it is not, in its view, what it seems

to us, an utter extinction of being, but rather and only as the cessation of individual existence, and the attainment of unlimited being. In the poetry of Wordsworth and Tennyson, Mr Moore clearly indicates the presence and influence of this theosophic idea, as allied to some of the purest phases of modern theism. But in this place we prefer to give the author's own sentiments on the subject. We shall therefore conclude our inadequate summary of this deeply-engaging treatise by a further quotation :—"The most pious souls have longed for a full and ever-present consciousness of a mutual indwelling of themselves and God. This has not been confined to the Christian faith ; but scarcely any stronger expression of it could be found than is contained in the Christian writings, 'In him we live and move and have our being.' 'Abide in me and I in you.' 'I in them and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one.' 'I am crucified with Christ : nevertheless I live ; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me.' The mysticism of all religions, however, has seized on the same idea of what may be called the spiritual absorption of the human soul in Deity. Of course none of these ideas are identical with the theory of absorption as Hinduism teaches it, but they seem to be sufficiently related to it, to justify us in suggesting that it is an elevation and not an extinction of being the eastern devotee desires." The reader will find this idea most exquisitely handled by Sir Thomas Browne in his majestic peroration to the tract on *Urn Burial*.

LAICUS.

XI.—FOREIGN LITERATURE.

Zeitschrift für die Historische Theologie. IV. Heft. Jahrgang, 1868.
Gotha, Perthes.

This number of the *Journal of Historical Theology*, contains two articles. The first is by Rippold, Professor of Theology in Heidelberg. The subject of it is, "David Joris of Delft : his Life, his Doctrine, and his Sect." This is the third article on the subject. The first having appeared in this Journal in 1863, and the second in 1864. The whole forms an interesting monograph. Joris was a glass-painter in the town of Delft in Holland. He became one of the most dangerous religious fanatics in connection with the great Anabaptist movement by which Germany was convulsed in the time of the Reformation, or immediately subsequent to it. Joris claimed to be the true Christ, and travelled over Germany disseminating his views both orally and by his writings. He became an object of great abhorrence to the authorities, and from fear of imprisonment he changed his name and retired to Basle, where he remained till his death in 1556. Rippold enters into the history of this remarkable man, and of the movement with which he was connected with great minuteness of

detail. The second article in the Journal is from the pen of the editor, Dr K. F. A. Kohnis. It presents a history of St Elizabeth, princess of Thuringia and Hesse, and founder of the order of the nuns of St Elizabeth. After she became a nun she retired to a hut near Marburg, and devoted herself to prayer and works of charity. She died in 1231. Dr Kohnis gives a deeply interesting account of her life and times.

Geschichte der altirischen Kirche und ihrer Verbindung mit Rom, Gallien, und Alemannien (von 430–680). Von CARL JOHANN GREITH, Bischof von St. Gallen. Freiburg i. B. 1867. London and Edinburgh: Williams and Norgate.

This is a history of the ancient Irish Church and its relations to Rome, France, and Germany, from A.D. 430 to 680, by Greith, the Bishop of St Galle, from an entirely Roman Catholic point of view. This is enough to give our readers an idea of the structure and spirit of the book. The author first gives a historical summary of the incidents connected with the dismemberment of the Roman Empire, and its bearing upon the progress of the Christian church. Then follow different chapters on the history of St Patrick and his mission in Ireland, St Columba and his mission among the Irish and Picts, St Columban and his labours on the continent, and St Gallus the apostle of Germany; the last portion of the work consists of a chapter on the doctrines of the Irish church. The author merits the praise of great industry and ingenuity. He has quoted almost the entire literature of the subject, and is evidently acquainted with works of note which within the last few years have appeared in this country. He seems, however, never to have come across Dr M'Lachlan's very admirable work on the "Ancient British Church," which we think most conclusively disposes of all attempts to discover popery or even prelacy in the church of the Culdees. This work by the Bishop of St Galle deserves to be read by those who would investigate the primordia of the British church, if for nothing else, at least, for the sake of the great mass of curious things which it contains, and the skilful way in which the author tries to make it apparent that full-blown popery was the religion of these primitive times. It is a goodly volume of 462 octavo pages. Bishop Greith is already well known as the author of a work on the German Mystics of the 13th and 14th centuries.

R. Rothe's Nachgelassene Predigten. Herausgegeben von Dr D. SCHENKEL. Erster Band. Elberfeld, 1868. London: Williams & Norgate.

Dr Richard Rothe's name stands prominent among the great leaders of German theology. The contemporary of the distinguished men, many of whom have now passed away from the scene of their earthly labours, whose mission was to lead the German Church out of the depths and the darkness of Rationalism, into the light of the knowledge

of divine truth, he was second to none of them in the ability and earnestness he displayed, and in the influence he exerted. From the very interesting memoir from the pen of the editor of the volume before us, Dr Schenkel, we learn that Dr Rothe was born at the town of Posen, on 28th January 1799, so that at the time of his death, 20th August 1867, he was about sixty-eight years of age. His first ecclesiastical appointment was as chaplain to the Prussian embassy at Rome. On the 11th January 1824, he entered on his ministry in that city. This volume contains forty-seven sermons, preached by him during his residence there till 1828. They are printed as they were found among his manuscripts. Though they have the usual disadvantage of being posthumous, yet they must evidently have been prepared with great care. One need not expect to find much of the gospel in these sermons, yet they are full of beautiful thoughts, and are plainly the production of no ordinary man. From Rome, he went in 1828 to occupy the place of Professor in the Theological Seminary at Wittenberg, whence, after a few years, he was removed to Heidelberg, where he held the double office of professor and seminary director. In 1849, he was called to Bonn as successor to Dr Nitzsch. In 1853, he succeeded Dr Ullmann at Heidelberg, and there he spent the remainder of his life. Dr Rothe's great work is his "*Theologische Ethik*" (Theological Ethics—Moral Theology). The first volume was published in 1845, and the third and last in 1848. A second edition is in progress. The first part was issued last year. This is a work of singular power. It has contributed more than perhaps any other since the days of Schleiermacher to influence the current of thought among speculative theologians. A translation of it into readable English would, we think, be a valuable addition to our theological literature.

The memoir accompanying this volume of sermons is worthy of separate publication, as containing a summary of the principal events affecting the church, and the progress of theology in Germany during the past half century. Schenkel writes as one who admired and loved his friend and colleague.

Nachlasspredigten ueber die Evangelien des Kirchenjahres. Von L. HARMS von Hermannsburg. Herausgegeben von CH. HARMS. Hermannsburg 1868. London and Edinburgh: Williams & Norgate.

This is a volume of posthumous sermons by the well-known Pastor Harms of Hermannsburg. It is edited by his brother, who prefixes the following note:—"In the name of Jesus. In this name, by which alone men can be blessed, is this collection of sermons by my beloved, never-to-be-forgotten brother, printed, and in this name it is now published, to be an offence to Satan and the world, to gladden the friends of the departed, and, may the Lord grant it, for the awakening, the edification, and the comfort of many souls. These sermons were, some of them, in my own possession, and some of them have been communicated to me by others. They were written out, not by the hand of others, but by the hand of my own beloved brother. But it may be said, Wherefore this collection of sermons? I have only to

say in reply, that the many friends of my brother, and admirers of his works, have a title to all that he has spoken and written for the glory of God, and I would blame myself if I should withhold anything from them, in so far as it agrees with the word of God, and may be useful to the kingdom of God." The sermons are sixty-two in number, and date from 1842 to 1849. They are on subjects chosen from the gospel narratives. They are earnest and loving in their tone, and are calculated to be useful, inasmuch as they are full of evangelical truth. It is easily seen that they have been preached in the land of Luther, and by a Lutheran.

Der Mensch Jesus Christus; Kurzgefasste Einleitung in die Geschichte des Menschlichen Wandels unsers Gottes und Herrn Jesu Christi. Dritte Ausgabe, von VIKTOR FRIEDRICH OEHLER, Pfarrer in Feuerbach bei Stuttgart. London and Edinburgh: Williams & Norgate. 1868.

This is the third edition of a very simple narrative of the life of our Lord on earth. The author, following the history of the evangelists, presents us with a very distinct portraiture of the man Christ Jesus. The work has nothing of a scientific character about it, but is wholly historical and practical. It consists of eighty-four brief chapters, with an appendix on the faith of the woman of Canaan, and of the nobleman of Capernaum. Oehler, who edits the book, says, in his preface, "This book was first published anonymously in the year 1762, with a dedication to Freidrich Carl von Moser, the son of the illustrious well-known John James Moser of Würtemberg. It was published a second time by the above-named Von Moser, in the year 1772. The author is Johann Carl Bretschneider, Russian aulic Counsellor at Schleiz, who was born at Gera on 8d August 1718. Of his circumstances in life very little is known. It would seem that he lived a long time at Ebersdorf, the seat of the Moravian Brethren (the Herrnhutters), together with John James Moser, from 1739 to 1747. He enjoyed long and intimate friendship with Fr. Carl von Moser, who says of him, 'He is no sectary fanatic or bigot, but a friend of the truth in the form in which he finds it in the Evangelical Lutheran Church, and which he professes with mouth and heart.'" The work is fitted to be useful.

Theologisch-homiletisches Bibelwerk. von Lange. Des Alten Testaments XIII. Theil: Das Hohelied und der Prediger Salomonis. Von Dr OTTO ZÖCKLER. 1868. London and Edinburgh: Williams & Norgate.

This instalment of Lange's Bibelwerk is distinguished by all the excellencies which characterise its predecessors. It is at once practical and critical, and fitted to be eminently useful for homiletical purposes. It consists of the Song of Solomon and the book of Ecclesiastes, from the pen of Dr Zöckler of the Evangelical Protestant University of Greifswalde, who is the author also of the commentary on the book of the Proverbs of Solomon, of the same series, which was published last year. The whole of the commentary on the New Testament,

with the exception of that on the book of Revelation, has now been published. The different parts of it are the combined work of thirteen distinguished evangelical divines. Of the Old Testament, six parts have now been published, and the remainder is in progress. This great Bibelwerk, when completed, will be one of the most valuable and comprehensive commentaries on sacred Scripture. The Messrs Clark of Edinburgh have conferred a great boon on British theologians by publishing a translation into English of parts of the New Testament portion of this work. Our American neighbours are following the same example, but we think they have done right in publishing, not a mere translation, but a translation carefully edited, and greatly improved by supplementary and corrective notes, by eminent American and British divines. This, no doubt, greatly enlarges the work, already bulky, but it adds immensely to its value as a work of constant reference. Having such a work, the reader is put in possession of all he, for the most part, needs to know on the subject inquired into. German theological books, even the best and the soundest of them, need such editing.

Bibel-Lexikon, Realwörterbuch zum Hand-gebrauch für Geistliche und Gemeindeglieder. Von Kirchenrath Professor Dr DANIEL SCHENKEL. Drittes und Viertes Heft. Leipzig: Brockhaus. London: Williams & Norgate.

The third and fourth parts of this excellent Bible Lexicon here before us, bear evidence of the spirited and thorough manner in which both the publisher and the editor are resolved to carry out their important undertaking. Dr Schenkel has summoned to his aid a large band of efficient collaborateurs. The articles are full of well-arranged information on all the subjects discussed. We are particularly pleased with a somewhat elaborate article in the fourth part on the Interpretations of the Bible (*Auslegung der Bibel*). As an historical exposition of the subject, it is very interesting and useful. The editor, Dr Schenkel, is a very learned and able theologian, but by no means to be relied on in his doctrinal expositions. He has a strong tinge of Rationalism.

Les Titres de la Dynastie Napoléonienne. Paris: Imprimerie Imperiale. 1868. Se vend chez HENRI PLON, Rue Garanciere, 8.

Some will have it that this pamphlet is the production of the Emperor Napoleon III. There is at least good reason to believe that it has not been published without his sanction. The image of the imperial eagle is emblazoned on the title-page; and within the writing is such as might be expected of a pen taken from its wing.

The ostensible design of the writer is stated in a prefatory note. "We have thought proper," says he, "to unite in one publication the several manifestations of the national will, which, under the two Republics and the two Empires, have founded the Napoleonic Dynasty. It seems to us that, from this collection, important in a historical point of view, there may proceed a grand lesson in politics."

A brief account is given of the conditions on which Napoleon I.

was elected:—in 1799, Consul for ten years; in 1802, Consul for life; and in 1804, Emperor, the imperial dignity to be hereditary in the direct descent from himself, and in the direct descent from Joseph Bonaparte and Louis Bonaparte. The number of votes, for and against, in each of the three cases, is given. The account is supported by quotations from official documents, and from the “History of the Consulate and the Empire,” by M. Thiers. Then follows a narrative of the circumstances in which Napoleon III. was recalled to France, the precise terms in which the people were appealed to, and the numbers of those who voted for and against him, when, by overwhelming majorities, he was elected,—in 1848, President of the Republic; in 1851, President for ten years; and in 1852, Emperor, with the imperial dignity hereditary in the Bonaparte family.

The text of the constitution of 1852 is next given in full, with notes of the modifications that have subsequently been made thereon. Tables are appended, shewing the state of the vote in the several departments of France, at the different times in which Napoleon III. was elected by universal suffrage.

Such is a summary of the distinct and classified proofs prepared and produced. To prove what? To prove that the Napoleonic dynasty, and particularly *the bases* of the constitution of 1852, can be modified or set aside only in the same way, and by the same means, by which they were established, namely, by the votes of the French people. That this is precisely the great aim of the writer comes out in page 42. He says, “*Les principes d’où la Constitution dérive furent donc le résultat d’un accord librement consenti. Mais si ces bases sont fixes, si elles ne peuvent être modifiées sans un plébiscite,*” &c. The argument, plainly stated, is simply this, A house can only be pulled down in the same order, and by the same means, by which it was built. Presented in this naked form to any practical man, the argument will be felt to have very little force. Hence the skilful wrapping of it up in rhetoric, and the giving of the conclusion by implication rather than by direct statement. The present emperor shewed clearly enough his trust in another kind of support, when he widened the narrow streets of Paris, and removed so far the means of throwing up the barricades by which previous dynasties were overthrown. Notwithstanding these and other measures which he has taken, he does not yet feel secure. He finds in the modern French the disposition which Julius Cæsar, whom he so much admires and imitates, observed in the ancient Gauls, “*Cum intelligeret omnes ferè Gallos novis rebus studere, et ad bellum mobiliter celeriterque excitari.*” (Cæsar’s Com. Lib. iii. 10.) And the present pamphlet is employed as a “useful” means to counteract the strong symptoms of the approaching outburst of that disposition, after a period of comparative inactivity. The impending danger, and the nature of the means employed to avert it, are thus described:—“At the moment when this constitution, which has been the fundamental compact between the people and the emperor, is become the object of attacks, more or less open, and, as it were the point aimed at by all the combined oppositions, it has appeared useful to us to place it again under the

eyes of the public, and to recall to mind the circumstances in which it was produced."—P. 41.

But whether or not the publication shall be "useful" to the extent desired in teaching "the grand lesson," chiefly intended by its author, it certainly affords to the general public, within a small compass, valuable materials for reflection on topics of European interest. The principles and spirit of the revolution of 1789, as held and defended and applied by the Napoleonic dynasty, are so exhibited as to be readily available for contrast with the *old régime* in France, and for comparison with the principles and working of the British constitution. Of old, the philosophers made their appeals to the *discerning few*; and the priests taught the suffering many, not only to obey and suffer patiently the ills laid upon them, but also to inflict penances on themselves, and to hope for happiness only in heaven. But Voltaire changed all that. His doctrine (*Hist. of Charles XII.*, B. vii.), that "the most incontestible right which any man can have to sovereignty is the unanimous consent of the people," is the great underlying principle of the new system. The first Napoleon, when first consul, publicly "*rendered homage to the sovereignty of the people.*"—P. 15. He praised them and promised them happiness in these terms: "The best of peoples shall be, as they deserve to be, the most happy, and their felicity shall contribute to that of the whole of Europe."—P. 17. Again, in his reply to the Senate regarding the question of the restoration of the monarchy, he says, "We have been constantly guided by this grand truth, that the sovereignty resides in the French people, in this sense, that all, all without exception, ought to be done for their interest, happiness, and glory."—Pp. 19, 20. On the same principle, and in the same spirit, the author of this pamphlet attempts, if not to deify, at least to identify the people with the Deity, by his use of the motto, "*Vox populi vox Dei.*"

All this is very different from the doctrine of the Holy Scriptures. They teach, not only that the voice of the people is distinct from the voice of God, but also that the one has often been directly opposed to the other. The distinction is clear in the Law, which defines the qualifications of the man to be elected as their king by the Israelites: "Thou shalt in any wise set him king over thee, whom the Lord thy God shall choose" (*Deut. xvii. 15*). Equally explicit is the testimony of the Prophets to the fact, that the voice of the people had often been directly opposed to the voice of God. His charge against them is, "They have set up kings, but not by me; they have made princes, and I knew it not" (*Hosea viii. 4*). No proof has yet been given that the French, or any other people, are more divine, or more connected with the divinity, than the people of Israel. And let those who pander to the pride of the French people be persuaded, from history and from the Scriptures, that God, in his own time, will make it manifest before all the nations, that they are "men and not God."

D. N.

The Bibleotheca Sacra. Andover, 1868. Nos. XCVIII. and XCIX.
April and July.

This American quarterly is the organ specially of the Independents of the Andover school. To a considerable degree it breathes the spirit of the so-called "Liberal Theology," and we would not endorse the views it advocates on several important doctrinal questions. At the same time, it cannot be denied that it is very ably conducted, and sustains, as a general rule, a high style in the ability and scientific thoroughness of its articles. The contributors are generally men of mark, for the most part professors in American colleges, yet there is occasionally a pretentiousness in the manner of their handling subjects which we do not always relish.

In the first of the two numbers before us (No. XCVIII.), there are five articles, besides notices of various publications. These are (1.) *Free Communion*, by the Rev. S. D. Clark. This is a continuation of the subject discussed in an article in a previous number. The writer enters into the whole question at great length, and argues zealously on behalf of free communion, or, as he styles it, "Free Sacramental Fellowship" between the different denominations. (2.) *The Natural Theology of Social Science*, by the Rev. Professor Bascom, of Williams College. This is a third article on the same subject by the author. He discusses, in a very interesting light, the subject of "*Value and Natural Agents*." It is a thoughtful, well-written article, discussing with philosophical penetration, and in a healthful tone, important principles in political economy. (3.) *Revelation and Inspiration*, by Dr Barrows, lately Professor of Hebrew, Andover. This also, like the others, is a continuation article. It treats of "*Modern Assumptions against the Supernatural*" under two heads—1. *The Supernatural in the Sphere of Nature*. In the discussion on which the author enters on this head, he very conclusively disposes of the development theory. He establishes also the supernatural origin of species. 2. *Revelation in the Sphere of Mind*. This discussion is also well conducted, and in a spirit of reverent submission to God's word. (4.) "*The Irish Mission in the Early Ages*," by the Rev. R. Anderson, D.D. Though the talent necessary to the production of this article may be estimated as of a lower rank, yet assuredly the article itself is more readable and attractive, and, in this respect, of a higher rank than any of the others in this number.

The contents of No. XCIX. are—(1.) "*Free Communion*," concluded from the preceding number. (2.) "*The Evangelical Lutheran Church in the United States*," by Dr Brown, Professor of Theology in the Theological Seminary of the General Synod, Gettysburg. This is the conclusion of a series of articles on the distinctive and peculiar doctrines of different theological sects and schools. The article is well written, and is full of important information. The subject is treated with very considerable fulness, and will repay a careful perusal. (3.) *Mill v. Hamilton*, by Dr Haven, Professor in Chicago Theological Seminary. The writer shews the importance of the points at issue between the two systems of philosophy at present contending for the mastery in Great Britain and America. Had we room

ence or the world without, springing from the mind itself. (2.) Another essential difference of perception. Hamilton affirms that in the action we are cognisant or conscious, not awakened by the object, but of the object contrary, affirms that we are cognisant *not* of the only of our affections and sensations in the system is a constructive idealism. (3.) As to the action are agreed that we know only the appearances, and never the things *per se*. Our knowledge is wholly relative. But while Hamilton holds that in perception we have direct, immediate knowledge—the *ego*—and also of the object perceived the contrary, affirms that we know immediately the self-perceiving—the *ego*, nor the object perceived *only* the impression produced, and the fact. The writer treats—2. Of the defects of Mill as (1.) His deriving all our knowledge and experience; (2.) in denying an immediate external world in perception; (3.) in reducing the external world, and of the mind itself, to a mere sensations, so that our knowledge of anything is reduced to this—that the thing seems to us to be a thing certain is, that we have such and such an impression or may not be correct. To us, constituted as we are, than the whole, and two and two make four, and that these things are so elsewhere and always, and that two and two may make five, what we regard as right and what we judge wrong may there be right and also defective, in that it fails to account for important mental phenomena. (5.) It undermines the distinction of fact and fiction.

of our nature, or an intuition of the mind, but arises from our inability to conceive the absolute commencement of anything. (2.) He also rejects Hamilton's *Theory of the Will*. Hamilton says we cannot conceive a free volition, for that would be a volition *without a cause*. Dr Haven, on the other hand, shews that a free volition is *not* a volition without a cause,—that it is a false idea of freedom to conceive of it as inconsistent with the idea of cause. In some other particulars also Hamilton's opinions are controverted. Notwithstanding these incongruities, however, which are found in some parts of his system, he is rightly spoken of as having “furnished more valuable contributions to speculative philosophy than any other British writer in this century.”

The fourth article of this number is on Gibbon the historian, which we have transferred to our journal.

The Biblical Repository and Princeton Review for July 1868.

This number of our old favourite does not contain any articles possessed of much general interest. One of them gives a detailed account of the proceedings of the late Assembly of the Old School Presbyterians, from which it would appear that several of our friends, such as Dr Breckinridge and others, have assumed an antagonistic position in regard to the proposed union with their brethren of the New School. They are not satisfied, it seems, with the proposal to receive the Westminster standards in their “historical and Calvinistic sense,” although this expression was inserted in the basis of union by the brethren of the New School, mainly for the purpose of allaying their suspicions. To us it appears very plain, that a wholesome change has come over the ministers and people of the New School: a generation has passed away since the controversy raged which divided the Presbyterians of America; most of those who took an active part on either side of it have been gathered to their fathers; and a new race of theologians has arisen who have no sympathy with the extreme views to which some of their leaders had pledged themselves. It seems hard, almost cruel, to revert to the old battles of thirty years ago, and to compel the young men who were then mere children, formally to condemn the errors of their fathers, before extending to them the right hand of fellowship. Truth does not demand such an immolation of natural feeling, and charity forbids it. If the great principles of religion involved in the quarrel are freely granted, it does not become those who have contended for them, nobly and faithfully it may be, in a former day, to insist that no union shall ever be allowed to take place which does not explicitly and directly recognise and do honour to them and their contendings.

We have been struck with the remarkable coincidence between the controversy to which we have now referred, and that which convulsed Scotland about the same period in regard to the voluntary question. Happily we live in days when all attempts to revive the acrimony and personal invective of that contest must prove utterly fruitless; and when the adoption of our common standards, apart from all the ques-

tions which led to strife and misunderstanding, promises to afford a rallying point for all their genuine adherents. But we may be permitted to refer to a previous controversy involving the same principles, that, namely, between what were called the *Old Light* and *New Light* Seceders. The adoption of the "Narrative and Testimony" by the latter of these parties, led to the deposition of the late Dr M'Crie and his brethren of the Old Light School, who protested against it as a defection from the constitutional principles of the Reformation. And yet in 1827, when the Doctor and his friends re-united with some of those who adhered to that "Narrative and Testimony," on a common basis of principles, Dr M'Crie steadily refused to allow any reference to be made to that document, or to any of the controversies about it, or to the depositions of himself and his brethren which followed upon it. The whole of their contendings in a state of separation against the New Light party were buried in silence; and over their grave a union was effected with his old brethren, founded on a series of propositions containing the points of divine truth on which the two parties had come to a mutual agreement. May we not hope that a cordial union, brought about in the same noble and truly liberal spirit, without any compromise of principle, may yet be effected among the Presbyterians at home as well as those of the United States.

XII. CRITICAL NOTICES.

Jesus Christ: His Times, Life, and Work. By E. DE PRESSENSÉ, D.D. Translated from the French by ANNIE HARWOOD. Second Edition, revised. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 27 Paternoster Row. 1868.

One of the forms in which vigorous efforts have been made in our day to undermine Christianity has been by the publication of Lives of Christ on the principle of denying his claims to a divine character and a divine mission, even to the mission of being a divinely-appointed prophet, representing him as, no doubt, a very extraordinary man, but still as nothing more than a man. Such works, some of which have attained a large circulation, have no doubt done harm; but they will ultimately be of advantage to the Christian cause, and have been so already, by stimulating to inquiries, which have resulted in triumphantly vindicating the divinity of the claims of Jesus, and in exposing the false philosophy and the misrepresentations of history, by which it has been attempted to set aside the divinity of his claims.

Such is the character of this work by Dr Pressensé. Endowed with gifts of a high order, possessing excellent intellectual powers, and able, from the affluence of his genius, to clothe his sentiments in the radiant hues of beauty and eloquence, giving freshness to old truths and enchanting the reader by striking thoughts and illustrations ever bursting forth, Dr Pressensé has consecrated himself with great earnestness to the task of delineating the life of the Son of man, who is also the Son of God, and has produced a work, which, though not altogether unexceptionable, is well adapted to do important service to the church of Christ, and especially to benefit the young, whom its fascinating pages are sure to attract.

In writing the life of Christ, the first question that comes up is that of the supernatural. If this is denied, then his history can be treated only as the history of a mere man—not as that of God manifest in the flesh, his incarnation, in that case, being supernatural. Renan and the Pantheistic school, of which he is so ardent a disciple, lay it down, as an indisputable axiom, that the supernatural is impossible; and upon the principle of Pantheism, which denies an intelligent personal cause distinct from the world, it no doubt is. Theism, too, rejects the supernatural, on the ground of the very perfection of the laws of nature, which appear to it to be immutable; but, unlike Pantheism, it does so inconsistently, for if the existence of a personal God, who has established the laws of nature, is admitted, the possibility of the supernatural is perfectly logical. Cannot the all-wise God, on extraordinary occasions, and for great purposes, break in upon or suspend the very order which he himself has established? In creating the world he did not renounce his own liberty, or bind himself with chains by the very laws he gave to creation. These topics Dr Pressensé takes up in the first chapter of the first book of his work, which treats of preliminary questions, and he conclusively argues out, in opposition to Pantheism and Theism, that the question of the possibility of the supernatural is as fairly a matter of discussion as any subject within the sphere of human thought; and thus we can enter, without obstruction, on the examination of the evidences of the divinity of Christ's claims.

In opposition to Renan and Strauss, and all the disciples of the Tübingen school, who strenuously maintain that the system which Christ taught was not original—that it was simply the offspring of the united genius of Greece and the East, Dr Pressensé has proved, by a succinct and faithful description of the religious and philosophical systems that preceded and existed at the time of Christ, that he could not derive his system from any school of philosophy or any system of religion then known, whether in Judea or in any other part of the world, and that it was the living contradiction of all that surrounded him. The importance of establishing this point cannot be over-estimated.

The author observes, that "the doctrinal and strictly theological does not come within the scope of this book." But while keeping this in view, there is one point to which, from its transcendent importance, greater prominence ought to have been given: for though in one sense it is doctrinal, in another it is historical, and, therefore, comes within the author's plan; and that is the great design of the incarnation and life of Christ in this world—a design to which all other designs, to be accomplished thereby, were secondary and subordinate, namely, that He might make satisfaction to divine justice for the sins of men by his vicarious obedience and sufferings, in order to their being justified and saved in a way consistent with the most perfect justice. When we consider how much is said on this theme by Christ himself in the Gospels, when we consider farther that it is the cardinal truth of Christianity, and that it is the only solution of the mystery of the humiliation, sufferings, and death of Christ, it ought to be conspicuously brought out in a history of the life of Christ. This subject is but slightly touched upon by Dr Pressensé, and when touched upon, the language is less definite than could be desired.

Dr Pressensé, we think, has failed to give the true interpretation of the agony of the Saviour in Gethsemane and on the cross. It comes far short of being a correct exposition of the mental agony which Christ endured on the cross, to say that "when passing through that unutterable anguish which precedes the breaking of the tie between body and soul, at least in every case of conscious dissolution, Jesus uttered the piercing cry, 'My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?'"—this anguish being intensified in his case from his knowing that his "rightful title is the Prince of Life," and that he "had done nothing to merit death," and "his failing conscious-

Thus does Tertullian establish the connection and oneness of the Old and New Testament, which equally bear testimony to the same God and the same Saviour. Such, indeed, might almost have been the title of the book; and thus, apart from its primary object, and though the heresies in refutation of which it was written are now extinct, it directly relates to questions contested in the present day, proving, in opposition to the cavils and objections against the Old Testament urged by Marcion, and still repeated by many, that no part of it is inconsistent with the righteousness and benevolence of the divine character.

The other volume, which is the first of the writings of Thascius Cyprian, who succeeded to the Bishoprick of Carthage in the year of our Lord 248, and who was beheaded at Carthage on the 14th of September 258, in the reign of the Emperor Valerian, contains his epistles and some of his treatises. His epistles are very important from the light they reflect on the state of the Christian church in the time in which he lived.

We cordially recommend these beautiful, valuable, and well-executed volumes. The Ante-Nicene Christian Library is in all respects deserving of encouragement.

London and Calcutta, Compared in their Heathenism, their Privileges, and their Prospects: Showing the great Claims of Foreign Missions upon the Christian Church. By JOSEPH MULLENS, D.D., Foreign Secretary to the London Missionary Society, and for twenty-two years Missionary of the Society in Calcutta. London: James Nisbet & Co., 21 Berners Street. 1868.

The title of this book, as the author informs us, was suggested by a statement which the Bishop of Oxford is reported to have made, "that it would have been a blessed thing for thousands of people in England to have been born in Calcutta; for there they would have had some chance of being brought within the means of grace; whereas in England they were entirely neglected." This extraordinary statement the author justly pronounces to be quite incorrect; and by a comparison made between the religious and moral condition of London and Calcutta, while doing ample justice to the missionary institutions in operation in the last mentioned city, he completely proves that it does not possess that superiority to London in point of religious advantages which the language of the Bishop of Oxford implies. It is at once manifest that a city containing eight hundred thousands Mohamedans and idolaters, among whom there are labouring only thirty-four missionaries, with fifty fellow-labourers of various kinds, must be vastly inferior in respect of religious advantages to the capital of England. But this volume is not wholly occupied with answering the Bishop of Oxford. It treats of the question of missions generally, and it powerfully advocates their claims on the Christian church.

John Hooper (Bishop and Martyr): His Times, Life, Death, and Opinions. By the Rev. J. C. RYLE, B.A., Vicar of Stradbroke, Suffolk. London: William Hunt & Company, Holles Street, Cavendish Square. Ipswich: William Hunt, Tavern Street.

This is a very interesting sketch of the Times, Life, Death, and Opinions of a man whose memory England ought never to cease to remember and to venerate as one of the most devoted and heroic of her reformers and martyrs. Forced in 1539, when he was forty-four years of age, or soon after, to leave England to escape the persecution raised by Henry VIII. on account of the six popish articles, Hooper resided for at least nine years in Switzerland, where, mingling with the Reformers of the Swiss cantons, he acquired those accurate views of doctrinal truth for which he was distinguished. Returning to England in May 1549, in the reign of Edward

perspicuity of expression, throwing a flood of light on the import of those weighty messages which these prophets were commissioned by heaven to deliver to a chosen, but too often a guilty, and, therefore, often a suffering people; and not to them only, but to all to whom the Scriptures come in every age. To the ministers of the Gospel these Commentaries will be invaluable.

The Westminster Confession of Faith Examined on the Basis of the Other Protestant Confessions. By JOSEPH TAYLOR GOODSIR. London: Williams & Norgate, 14 Henrietta Street, Covent Garden. Edinburgh: 20 South Frederick Street. 1868.

In this work the author appears as an assailant of the Westminster Confession of Faith. His leading charge against it is, that its doctrine, as he represents it, of an entirely gratuitous justification by faith alone, exclusive of subjective spiritual and moral principles, and their fruits as elements or conditions of justification, is theoretically Antinomian. His object is to establish this charge, to shew that this doctrine of justification is Lutherano-Calvinism, and that it was not the doctrine held by Knox and the primitive Reformed Church of Scotland. To this undertaking the author has brought an earnest and vigorous pen; but he has completely failed to prove either that the Westminster standards are heretical, or that one part of them is inconsistent with another. To vindicate the doctrine of justification, as exhibited in the Westminster Confession, from the stigma of Antinomianism, it is only necessary to mark the care and the distinctness with which it maintains that though justification is by faith only, yet that faith "is not alone in the person justified, but is ever accompanied with all other saving graces, and is not dead faith, but worketh by love." Our limits will not permit us to enter into the author's argument. One thing somewhat remarkable is, that though his work is a large volume, yet it contains only a few pages in which he attempts, and that by the feeblest exegetical effort, to prove from the inspired Word that these standards are erroneous or heretical. By not grappling with the Scriptural argument, elaborate and prolix as he is in the discussion, he is all the while beating the air. To prove that the doctrine of the Westminster Confession on the article in question is Lutherano-Calvinism, which we think it is, is no proof, as the author seems to imagine, that that formulary is in error. And had Knox, as the author labours at great length to prove, held an opinion different from that of Luther and Calvin on the article of justification, that would, in like manner, have been no proof, unless we suppose Knox to have been inspired, of the heterodoxy of the Westminster standards.

But in point of fact Knox's sentiments on justification entirely harmonised with those of Luther and Calvin. In his history he gives at length, and with warm approval, the "Places" of Patrick Hamilton, in which the doctrine of justification is stated, as it was laid down by Luther and Melancthon, from whom, when at Wittenberg, he had learned evangelical truth. Calvin's larger catechism, in which his views of justification are fully given, was, by the advice of Knox translated, circulated, and taught in Scotland some years before the great Reformation of 1660. What is still more decisive is, that Henry Balnaves's treatise on Justification by Faith, in which the doctrine of Luther and Calvin on that article is expressed at great length, was so highly approved by Knox, that he revised it, divided it into chapters, added a very complete summary of its contents, and recommended it in the highest terms, and without qualification, in a letter to the Reformed Church of St Andrews in 1548.

In the Reformed Confession of 1660, in the composition of which Knox no doubt had an important part—the only document from which Mr

variety in the mode of expression, such as : a man who did not copy from these Reformatments from the sacred Scriptures ; but the his sentiments and theirs on this doctrine, as Mr Goodsir does, a difference of sentimentology, we take him to be so singularly unsimply perplexes and bewilders the reader charges against the Westminster Confession objection. He caricatures and misrepresents upon its language, which the compiler which those who adhere to it as an ecclesiastical manner, repudiate.

Church Constitution of the Bohemian and Moravian Church, with a Translation, Notes, and a Preface by the Bishop of the Brethren's Church. London: Hatton Garden. 1866.

The Bohemian and Moravian Brethren, the followers of John Huss. Having separated with the exception of giving the cup to the not otherwise differ from the Church of Rome body sixty years before Luther commenced reformation, as was to be expected, these the interest of the Reformers in Germany, Sweden and Luther, Melancthon, Bucer, Calvin, Beza mony to the purity of their doctrine and to an early period they were brought into contact and this had an important effect in moulding which is a combination of Presbyterian and elements, the governing council consisting senior bishop always presiding, and the pope the bishops, whilst the ultimate authority is outlines of their ecclesiastical constitution Faith, which at different times they present



